DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 024 AC 003 726

By-Schwertman, John B.
I Want Many Lodestars. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, 21.
Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Brookline, Mass.
Pub Date Sep 58
Note-123p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.25
Descriptors-Adult Learning, Continuous Learning, *Curriculum Planning, Educational Objectives, *Educational Philosophy, Educational Practice, General Education, *Learning Theories, *Program Evaluation, Research, Specialization, Undergraduate Study, *University Extension

Essays call for the development of a theory of university adult education and for the development of new and expanded research into basic problems of curriculum planning, learning theory, and evaluation of the results of liberal adult education programs. The urban university is asked to examine its purposes in adult education, which is often its largest educational activity. Questions are raised and answers suggested about the differences between teaching the adult and teaching the schoolboy. What does it mean to our teaching that the adult has more experience, different experience, and experience differently organized? Will the goals, patterns, and procedures of education that succeed with the undergraduate succeed equally well with adults? How much general education, and how much specialized education, should an undergraduate have? and in what order? If we assume that graduates will continue to learn throughout their lives, what education is most appropriate for them in school and after school? (eb)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

**notes
and
essays** on education for adults

number
21

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Doris Chertow

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

ED0 30024

I Want Many Lodestars

JOHN B. SCHWERTMAN

AC003726

center for the study of liberal education for adults
4819 greenwood avenue · chicago 15, illinois

an organization established by a grant from the fund for adult education to work with the universities providing liberal education for adults.

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS was established as the result of a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with the universities providing liberal education for adults. The official purpose of the Center is to "provide aid and leadership to the forces that can develop the evening college and extension movement into a more effective instrument for the liberal education of adults." Communications may be addressed to the Director, 4819 Greenwood Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois.

Publications of the Center are listed on the back covers, with information as to how they may be obtained.

I WANT MANY LODESTARS

by

John B. Schwertman

FORMER DIRECTOR, THE CENTER
FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL
EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

Edited by Harry L. Miller, Assistant Director

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS
September 1958

COPYRIGHT 1958 BY THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF
LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS. ALL RIGHTS
RESERVED. PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER 1958

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

PREFACE

The essays and speeches that constitute this volume are by a man who had an extraordinary influence on an important part of American education: the education of adults in the university setting. His influence was the more extraordinary because he was concerned with university education for adults only briefly.

John Schwertman came to the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults as half-time Assistant Director in February, 1952. He became full-time Assistant Director that Spring, and he became Acting Director in February, 1953. Several months later he was appointed Director of the Center.

When Schwertman came to the Center, he was Assistant to the President of Roosevelt College, now Roosevelt University. He had a general administrator's interest in the evening classes and other adult education activities of Roosevelt College, but he had no special interest in university education for adults and surely did not think of himself as an "adult educator." Four years later he was an outstanding leader in the field.

Dying at 41, Schwertman lived only half a life. Only four years of his half a life were devoted to the Center and to university education for adults. The earliest and latest papers included in this volume are separated by less than three years, and writing articles and speeches about adult education were minor parts of their author's job. I emphasize the brevity of his life and of his work in adult education, and the fact that these are occasional papers, to make it clear that his colleagues do not present this volume as a life work. These papers are important in a field in which there is a growing and improving literature. But they were regarded by their author as opportunities to try out ideas that he held tentatively on critical audiences of his colleagues. They do not cover enough time to show how his ideas changed, how hospitable he was to new ideas and to criticism, nor how he and his influence were growing. They are not the last word on university education for adults. They are not John

Schwertman's last word—he never said his last word and would not had he lived to Methuselah's age.

These papers, then, are tentative and important. They are important partly because they are tentative. They ask important questions and leave those questions open.

They ask for a theory, for example. The continuing education of adults has become an important activity of the urban university. In many universities there are more "adult" students than "college-age" undergraduates —many more. But many university people are still unaware of this fact and others are indifferent to it. Many universities have entered "the evening-college business" with no clear understanding of what the business is. Schwertman does not give us a rationale for university education for adults. He asks for one. Or for several. There are theories of undergraduate education (although they ignore the adult who is an undergraduate). The graduate schools have a rationale and are under pressure to re-examine it. Education for the several professions has its rationale. Schwertman asks the urban university to examine its purposes in what is often its largest educational activity. The request seems reasonable, especially since he also gives us places to start the examination and suggests criteria of appropriateness to the university.

There are other recurrent themes in these papers. Educators who work with adult students often affirm that the adult in school differs from the schoolboy in ways significant to his learning. For example, "he has more experience, he has different experience, and his experience is differently organized." What does this mean to our teaching? Does it follow that goals and patterns and procedures of education that succeed with typical undergraduates will not succeed equally well with adults? If not, what will succeed? These papers raise the questions. They ask us to find out; and they suggest answers.

American higher education has for some time assumed that an educated man needs both "general" and "specialized" education. How much of each? In what order? Often this debate assumes that education ends with the award of a degree. These papers ask for a re-examination of the question on the contrary assumption that education need not end with graduation from a "terminal" school. If we assume that graduates of our schools will continue to learn throughout their lives, what education is most appropriate for them in school and after school? The suggested answers to these questions are more than merely provocative.

A glance through the footnotes in this volume will give an idea of the scope and recency of the growing literature about university education for adults. It will not show that John Schwertman was largely responsible, through the Center of which he was director, for stimulating much of that literature and often for publishing some of the best of it. It is still true that many people in our universities are indifferent to the education of adults, just as some are indifferent to the problems of professional education and others to the problems of undergraduate liberal education. The professor of French is not much concerned with legal education, and the professor of law not much worried about the problems of the undergraduate college. Neither is likely to be much concerned about the adult in college. But the indifferent are fewer than they were. Those who are not indifferent were given important assistance, support, and encouragement by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults during the too few years of John Schwertman's directorship.

This introduction is not for those who work in university education for adults. They know John Schwertman's importance. That these papers were selected and edited by the colleague who was Schwertman's Assistant Director, that the Introduction is by the present Director, and that this Preface is by his predecessor as Director of the Center are indications of the esteem that his colleagues had for him.

John S. Diekhoff

INTRODUCTION

A review of John Schwertman's papers two years after his death suggests that, representing as they do many of John's ideas about problems and directions in university adult education, they not only have posed important problems about the need for a theory in adult education but also have enormously influenced the direction of subsequent experimentation and research in the field of university adult education.

The papers and speeches in this volume cannot be read merely as philosophic treatises or only as think-pieces and ivory-towered ruminations. They must also be viewed as ideas, proposals, trial-balloons and dreams which have influenced the direction and growth of university adult education since John's untimely death. If we regard them as pebbles dropped into the more or less placid waters of university adult education we cannot but be vastly impressed by the extent to which they have stirred up ripples still activating the field and influencing the individuals in it.

One of John Schwertman's major roles was that of bringing to bear on adult education planning the most challenging ideas, thinking and research in the behavioral and social sciences. He was not so much an innovator or producer of new ideas as he was a man who was sensitive to the important advances and frontiers in the intellectual world, who could see and dramatize the implications of these ideas.

Furthermore, we are impressed by the way in which Schwertman translated these ideas into suggestions for specific research, action and programming. He was intensely aware of timing, and he was a master of the art of dramatizing important, contemporary, immediate and relevant ideas in such a way that they would have maximum impact on individuals.

Reviewing activities in the field of university adult education since these papers were written, I am amazed at the extent to which so many of the pioneering programs now being undertaken by both private and state universities were first suggested by ideas expressed here.

For example, at this time some ten universities are contemplating the development of special degree programs for adults at the Associate, Baccalaureate and Masters levels. Schwertman proposed this development and foretold this direction in his paper on "General and Specialized Education," and in the one on "Adult Education Third Force—Concept of Meta-Credit."

Since these papers were written—and in a number of them Schwertman called for a better relationship between specialized and general education (see especially, "General Education and Specialized Education" and "Adult Education—Lodestar of Democracy?")—a large number of programs aimed at providing generalized liberal education programs for specialists groups have been undertaken and are now proliferating. Among these are liberal education programs for secretaries, union members, Deans and Directors of adult education divisions, graduate programs for teachers, community leaders, and for alumni, and some rapidly developing ideas for liberal education programs for engineers. We at the Center, at this moment, look upon the problem of developing special audiences for liberal education (combining specialist and general education) as one of our four major areas of activity.

In another paper, "Intellectual Challenge of Education," John Schwertman emphasized the potential challenge of adult education to regular faculty members. He proposed that a new element of intellectual excitement can be provided to faculty members by more active involvement in adult education enterprises, research and planning. This challenge is being increasingly implemented through active emphasis on the involvement of regular faculty in the planning of liberal adult education programs for various specialist groups. During the past few years regular faculty members have become increasingly involved in planning special adult programs at Penn State, the University of Washington, Northern Illinois University, Rutgers, and a number of other institutions. As Schwertman suggested, involving regular faculty in planning programs for adults has enormously increased the interest of regular faculty in the adult field. This need for better utilization of regular faculty in research and planning in adult education is probably one of the greatest areas of interest in university adult education; it is also one of the Center's major areas of concern, as is evidenced by its grants to institutions for special faculty programs, its forthcoming publication "New Directions in Faculty

Development" and its central concern at the 1959 Leadership Conference with the problem of faculty relations and development.

Throughout his papers, John Schwertman called not only for the development of a theory of university adult education but also for the development of new and expanded research into basic problems of curriculum-planning, learning-theory and evaluation of the results of liberal adult education programs. This concern has also been reflected in recent field activities. Representatives of some twenty liberal education programs met in 1958 to launch a research project aimed at further defining some common objectives of liberal adult education programs. At the same time, preliminary steps are being taken to develop methods of scientifically determining the extent to which these objectives can be achieved through liberal adult education programs.

Examples of programs which owe their existence, at least in part, to ideas developed or publicized by Schwertman both in these published papers and also in discussions and consultations could be cited at great length. His concern with the effectiveness of liberal education in the development of effective leadership in the U. S. is becoming increasingly mirrored in the programs and directions of the Fund for Adult Education. His desire to see in what ways liberal education might have an impact on primarily practical community development programs is being tested in several experimental programs in the field of community development. His emphasis on the continuing need for a discussion of purpose as the central and highest concern of adult educators is being carried on through a variety of conferences and through the current publications of the Center.

In almost every one of these papers one can find the catalyzing force or germ of an idea which is still actively influencing present and new directions in university adult education.

As a re-reading of these papers indicates, John Schwertman's place in the field of university adult education will emerge not transitory, but rather as continuing: his thoughts, reflections, ideas, and barbs are still being felt in the field; they are still an important force not only in present activities but in future experimentation as well.

As Schwertman's successor at the Center I can only emphasize the extent to which a re-reading of his papers has made me realize the debt which I personally owe to him for stimulating my thinking and experimentation. I believe that all of our staff and many of the leaders in the field will become similarly aware of this debt as they re-read these papers.

It is our hope in publishing these papers two years after John's death that he will through them continue to influence us; we hope that some of his sense of excitement and searching can be translated for all of us, so that we may emulate John in seeking as many challenging lodestars in the field of liberal adult education as he did.

A. A. Liveright

EDITOR'S NOTE

Most of these papers were written for spoken delivery, not for the printed page. The major editorial changes, therefore, involved the elimination of audience and place references wherever possible. In those cases where such elimination would have meant awkwardness or loss of clarity, I have left them in. I have indicated by footnotes where extensive cutting was done to eliminate duplication of ideas.

HLM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface iii
Introduction vii
Editor's Note xi
I Am a Slippery Subject 1
The University Evening College 13
The Intellectual Challenge of Adult Education 17
The Need for Theory in Adult Education 25
Emerging Theory in Adult Education 31
Adult Education—Means or End 35
Continuing Education and the Problem of Excellence 41
Adult Education: Lodestar of Democracy? 51
General Education and Specialized Education 59
Adult Education's Third Force: The Concept of Meta-credit . . . 68
Can Adult Education Associations Amount to Much? 79
Voluntary Planning: From Co-ordination to Action to Purpose . . 87
Planning for Growth in Adult Education 98

I AM A SLIPPERY SUBJECT

Some Remarks on the Individual and Adult Education

I am a slippery subject.

The "Individual" is an abstraction, yet standing before you, I seem real enough. I am an American citizen; I have a job, two children and became forty years old just a week ago today. Such "facts"—and others of similar nature—you can learn about me.

But everything about me you can never know—partly because there are many things I cannot know about myself.

Touch me one way and I am a psychological "case," another way and I am a social statistic, a third way and I am a group member playing social roles, still another way and I am a political animal; some would call me a child of God cursed with the original sin of Adam; others would call me a prisoner chained, face to the wall, deep in Plato's cave.

Who, then, is this individual? I can only reply: I am a number of things, depending upon how I am looked at. This, I believe, is why "the individual," in the abstract, is such a difficult subject.

To deal with this subject, I am going to talk about myself. But I shall talk about myself in an unusual way—neither in the popular way of "confession" or "self analysis," in the manner of a Lucy Freeman's struggle against neurosis, nor as Henry Adams reflected upon life and education. I cannot even offer you the interesting story of a reformed alcoholic. I do not know enough about Oedipus to deal with his complexes, nor do I have the ability to interpret dreams.

What I shall try to do is to talk about myself—an individual adult, and do so in terms of how experts and researchers see me. I hope you will not feel me pretentious or egocentric, for I am really talking about you too—and the clientele you serve. We are all slippery subjects, defying both the vagueness of abstraction and the simplicity of typology. The "I" used in this paper is an editorial "I," the "Me" an editorial "Me."

The experts agree that I am an adult, but they are not sure where to place me on the life cycle. Am I in early adulthood, middle adulthood, or am I in a more undefined period termed by some "the adolescence of maturity"?

But if the experts seem to go out of their way to make difficult some things that seem simple, others appear to prefer simple designations for some things that appear complex. For example, because I like to try to dress well and to keep physically fit, my authoritarian personality friends would probably say that I tend to be the personality type they call "a muscular Christian," despite the fact that I am neither very muscular nor very Christian. Furthermore, for some personality characteristics there are no specific references in the research literature. For example, I love roller coasters and to play with childrens' toys as well as I enjoy discussing great books, but I cannot find where the experts provide a label for such a type.

Professor Havighurst says that my life is dominated by the "developmental tasks" I face at various periods in the life cycle.[1] I find this concept meaningful. He defines the concept as follows:

> "A developmental task is a task which arises at or about a certain period in the life of an individual, successful achievement of which leads to his happiness and to success with later tasks, while failure leads to unhappiness in the individual, disapproval by the society, and difficulty with later tasks."[2]

This seems to make sense, but then I read humanists like Archibald MacLeish who write about the deep sickness of our culture and call upon me to reform it. I am reminded that men like Socrates, Christ, and Gandhi, out of harmony with their societies, were not happy and successful in the sense Havighurst is using the terms.

But for the "average guy"—a slippery subject though he is—we might say that achievement of these developmental tasks does lead to happiness at least at the operational level of living.[3] Havighurst calls upon education to help individuals achieve certain of their developmental tasks when he says,

---

[1] Robert J. Havighurst, Human Development and Education. New York. Longmans, Green & Co., 1953.

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

[3] Perhaps one way to define the humanist's role in adult education is to say that he should be primarily concerned with the non-operational levels of living. By this I mean that it may well be the supreme obliga-

> "When the body is ripe, and society requires, and the self is ready to achieve a certain task, the teachable moment has come."[4]

The "teachable moment"—the dream of the educator; certainly, another useful concept in dealing with individuals. What, precisely, does he mean?

I turn to Havighurst's report on early adulthood,[5] for by this time I cannot stomach the thought that I am a middle-aged man. He says: "Of all the periods of life early adulthood is the fullest of teachable moments and the emptiest of efforts to teach."

This age, say 21 to 45, is said to be my "period of storm and stress," mainly because I have moved, according to Havighurst, from an age-graded to a social status-graded society. No longer do I rate simply because I am 18 years old and my kid brother is only 15. Now I am in an adult society where prestige and power depend not on age but upon such things as skill, strength, wisdom, and family or social connections. My developmental tasks are to select a mate, learn to live with a marriage partner, start a family, rear children, manage a home, get started in an occupation, take on civic responsibility, and find a congenial social group. Achieving these tasks does not, of course, depend upon age. There is no reason to believe I am better able to get started in a job when I am 30 than when I am 20. But we do know that if my father is a white, Protestant bank president, I will probably get a better job to start with than if my father were a Mexican "wetback" laborer. This I think is what Havighurst means when he says that as we grow older, we pass from an age-graded to a social-status graded society.

So far, so good. But some of the tasks are more frightening. For ex-

---

tion of the humanist to deal with individuals, not so much in terms of what they need to meet the tasks of day-to-day operations, but rather constantly to test the needs of the times by placing them in a larger time perspective. That is, when a social scientist finds that in our kind of society it is generally a "good thing" for people to adjust to a combination of forces they can only incompletely control, it is then that we especially need the humanist to remind us that there can be times and events which make adjustment less virtuous than revolt.

[4] Ibid., p. 5.

[5] Ibid., Ch. 16.

ample, as I plow into my forties, I am told that I must accept and adjust to the physiological changes of middle age. As the biological basis for this task I read that the physical symptoms are:[6]

> "Growth of stiff hair on the nose, ears, and eyelashes of men;
> Growth of hair on upper lip of women;
> Drying and wrinkling of the skin;
> Deposition of fat around the middle;
> Presbyopia—loss of accommodative power of the lens of the eye."

Is this me—the individual adult? I resolve to defy these ravages of time, only to wonder if I am merely postponing their acceptance. At this point I may go to my library and put my name on the waiting list for Norman Vincent Peale's latest. Or perhaps better still, I choose another way of looking at myself.

The next discovery is more disquieting: I am holes punched into cards. Some of my fellow-men look at me as a group of statistics conjured up for their benefit. For example, most of you have at one time or another received from Time Magazine, Inc. a punched card inviting you to be a special subscriber. I look at this card in wonder. Here I am, the individual, a series of holes in a card. This card neatly describes me—my income, marital status, race, creed, reading habit classification, and so on. These cards represent a way of looking at an individual—as a taxpayer, a sales target, a utilities consumer, a student, or a library patron.

Parenthetically, a colleague of mine was reflecting one day on this card-punch situation. He mischievously wondered what would happen if he took one of these Time, Inc. cards, carefully added just one more punch and sent the card back. He had visions of the Henry Luce empire lying in a state of confusion and ruin, thousands of copies of Time magazine sent to Peiping instead of to Formosa.

The things the experts seem to know most about is my ability to learn. I am told that my power to learn develops rapidly until I am 18, that between 18 and 21 this power continues to grow but at a slower rate. My peak power, as measured by test scores, occurs around my 21st birthday. Then a long, slow decline sets in until at age 55 my learning ability is about back where it was when I was 14, my early high school years.[7]

---

[6] Ibid., p. 273.

[7] Harold E. Jones and Herbert S. Conrad. The Growth and Decline

But lest these data discourage me, several experts rush to rescue my morale. These declining test scores may not be due to actual loss of learning ability, but to factors such as disuse or "rustiness," remoteness from schooling, and lack of practice in taking paper-pencil tests.[8]

Furthermore, I am told that perhaps my intellectual qualities do not decline; they merely become organized differently as I grow older.[9] That is, although there probably is a "general" intelligence factor, and although this apparently declines slowly and gradually with age, we are even more certain that this "general" intelligence factor is made up of a number of "specific" factors. On some of these "specific" factors my intelligence may actually increase with age, especially on those factors which are less influenced by previously established habits and more influenced by daily life experience.[10] For example, one factor in intelligence is believed to be the ability to perceive "spatial" relationships accurately. Because the daily lives of most of us do not call for the frequent exercise of this ability, our test score performance on this factor may go down as we grow older; but on the factor of "word fluency" many of us would probably continue to show a growth for quite a few years beyond the so-called "peak" age of 21. Furthermore, "word fluency" as an intelligence factor may, for a lawyer, perhaps, combine or organize, at age 40, with another factor, "induction or reasoning," in a different and more effective way than would have been possible at the less experienced age of 18.

Dr. Floyd Ruch states: ". . . old age in man brings a deterioration of learning ability which is not general but depends to a significant extent upon the nature of the material learned."[11] In any event, the speed with which we learn is often confused with sheer mental power. And Irving Lorge points out that as I grow older, I may learn as well, but not so fast.[12]

---

of Intelligence: The Study of a Homogeneous Group between the Ages of Ten and Sixty. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1933, Vol. 13, pp. 223-298.

[8] Ibid.

[9] H. E. Garrett. "A Developmental Theory of Intelligence," The American Psychologist, 1946, Vol. 1, pp. 372-378.

[10] Floyd L. Ruch. "The Differentiative Effects of Age upon Human Learning," Journal of General Psychology, 1934, Vol. II, pp. 261-286.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Irving Lorge. "The Influence of the Test upon the Nature of Mental Decline as a Function of Age," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1936,

Lorge concludes that "it is clear that reported curves of mental decline with age are exaggerated."

We know too that "individual differences amongst those of the same age . . . enormously outweigh differences between ages."[13] Thus I can derive comfort from knowing that at age 40 my general learning power exceeds that of many 21 year olds.

Furthermore, as an adult, most of the things I need to learn do not tax the *peak* of my mental power. For example, we adults obviously *run* less swiftly than we did ten years ago, but we *walk* just about as effectively as we did then.

My ego is further strengthened by noting a growing tendency of the experts to regard me, the individual adult, as a richly interesting specimen. My age is only one factor in my ability to learn, and ability to learn is only one factor making for success, effective work production, and achievement. Interest, motivation, goals and values, and a host of intangible qualities must be considered if the adult educator is to understand the abstraction we call "the individual."

What can the experts tell me about these intangibles?

The first data I encounter give me a jolt: If I have any thought of becoming a creative genius after forty, chances are I will not.[14] What about Socrates? Didn't he learn to play the flute at seventy? He did, but there is no evidence that he was a genius at playing the flute. There are exceptional men who achieved creative works at a late age,[15] but by and large, intellectual brilliance, creativity, and genius come early in life or not at all.

However, the age of which creativity flowers differs according to the field of endeavor.[16] It occurs earliest in the physical sciences, mathe-

---

Vol. 27, pp. 100-110.

[13] Thorndike, as quoted by Jones and Conrad, *op. cit.*

[14] Harvey C. Lehman. *Age and Achievement.* Princeton, N. J. Princeton University Press, 1953. Most of the data cited from here to footnote reference #17 comes from Lehman's studies which he undertook on behalf of the American Philosophical Society.

[15] For example: John Dewey, William Harvey, Asa Gray in botany, Cervantes, Laplace, Goethe, Meyerbeer, and a host of others.

[16] Lehman, *op. cit.*, pp. 324ff.

matics and inventions. In these fields the great creative contributions have been made in the late 20's or early 30's. The biological sciences seem to produce their geniuses later. First-rate contributions to history, literature, education, philosophy, art and music occur still later, but even in these fields in which maturity and experience pay off, most great contributions are made before the age of 40. And looking back historically, the research evidence suggests that the most recent workers exhibited their outstanding creative ingenuity at younger ages than did workers of earlier eras.

All this might lead me at the threshold of the forties to say—"Ah me, the world is for the young."

But such is not the case. For here we encounter an interesting phenomenon: whereas brilliance, creativity and genius may be for the more youthful, positions of power, wealth and leadership appear to be reserved for those in the older age brackets.

For example, my best chance of becoming a college president is in my early 50's; if I yearn to be an ambassador or a U.S. senator, age 60 is the prime opportunity. The men who control our armed forces average between 60 and 64, our supreme court justices 70 to 74. And if I want to be a Pope, I need feel no anxiety until I reach 82.

My best chance of earning $50,000 a year will arrive with my 60th birthday, and to receive a million a year, alas, I shall probably have to wait until I am 80!

With all this power, status and wealth, I guess we can hold the bright youngsters in their places. The main point here is that data indicate that "success" as our society regards it is due, perhaps most often, to factors other than sheer brain power and creativity. And all of us certainly know that this is not a comfortable era for "eggheads."

These data on the relation of age to achievement are not without social significance, but for adult educators the data on adults' goals, values, attitudes and interests are probably more important. In these matters, I—the individual adult—really become a slippery subject because the subtleties and difficulties are infinitely complex.

Folklore has it that at 40 I have become fixed in my ways, conservative, more sedentary and inert in my goals, values and attitudes. But, thank goodness, I am not so easily described. I can change and I do change, but as I grow older it becomes more difficult. I get more settled in my job and become less willing to try new varieties of work; I like competition less and less; I become increasingly fond of regular working hours, methodical work and methodical people. I do not like to change what I am doing; I like to stay in one place.[17]

But some important things do change for me. My perspective of time changes rather dramatically. Suddenly I come to regard the future as now. I am suddenly aware that for me there is not as much "future" as there once was. This realization becomes as obvious as it is shocking. I am told that I am likely to become more interested in such opposite things as genealogy and eternity. It is predicted that my religious interest and activity will increase.[18] My interest in money decreases as my interest in the Hereafter increases.[19] I will suddenly realize that "I can't take it with me!" This shift from concern with material values to concern for religious and philosophic ones seems to be of great importance especially to two of our social institutions engaged in adult education—the church and the library.

Reflecting upon my own experience I can see that it is true that as I grow older I tend to become set in my ways. But although I have no research data to cite, it is my impression that I become happier to the extent that I overcome inertia and retain flexibility. To be subjective for a moment, life's basic maxim for me is contained in two words: "Keep Growing!" I believe this subjective feeling has to some extent been validated by many researchers in gerontology, certainly by those of the Havighurst persuasion.

There is, moreover, evidence to suggest that as we grow older, concepts and attitudes change more than some of the earlier research on interests would indicate. For example, using a theoretical framework

---

17. E. K. Strong, Jr. Change of Interests with Age. Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1931.

18. R. S. Cravan, E. W. Burgess, R. J. Havighurst, and H. Goldhamer, Personal Adjustment in Old Age. Chicago, Science Research Associates, 1949 (Ch. V).

19. Christine M. Morgan. "Factors Related to Personal Adjustment in Old Age," Ch. 71 in Kuhlen and Thompson. Psychological Studies of Human Development. New York. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952.

evolved by the French psychologist, Piaget, an ingenious research designed by Dennis and Russell showed that in senescence the concepts change sharply in the direction of becoming more like those held by children. This, of course, confirms one of the long-held notions about senility. But more to the point here is that this research yielded another outcome, that concept changes occurring during maturity are not very effectively measured by the conventional instruments which rely upon vocabulary response.[20]

Other studies suggest that the older age groups are really not much more conservative than younger groups. One such study tells me that although it is more difficult to change my attitudes than it is to change those held by high school and college students, my attitudes do change when systematic effort is made to change them.[21]

Furthermore, I as an adult when compared with high school and college students, enjoy two qualities which seem desirable for a democratic society. First, as an individual I have more independence and autonomy in the sense that I am better able to resist group pressure; and second, I do not so easily and uncritically swallow what "authorities" have to say.

As I grow older, there is one strong tendency I should like to avoid; it is the tendency to be more easily threatened. I have less enthusiasm for new situations; I dislike being evaluated in comparison with other people; and at the extreme, I become antagonistic to the notion of change itself.[22]

Finally, in terms of some interests and activities I will probably differ from women of my own age. Until I am about sixty I will have the same number of companions as a woman has; after sixty I will tend to have more, probably due to the larger incidence of widowhood; a woman's most severe social and economic task will probably be an adjustment to widowhood; mine is likely to be an adjustment to occupational changes, culminating

---

20. Wayne Dennis and Betty Mallinger. "Animism and Related Tendencies in Senescence," Journal of Gerontology, 1949, Vol. 4, pp. 218-221.

21. C. H. Marple. "The Comparative Susceptibility of Three Age Levels to the Suggestion of Group Versus Expert Opinion," Journal of Social Psychology, 1933, Vol. 4, pp. 176-186.

22. See earlier cited studies by E. K. Strong, Jr. and Ruth S. Cravan et al.

in retirement. Compared with women, I am likely to view the future more hopefully and am more likely to make plans for it. In the upper reaches of old age, I will probably be more active than a woman, but she is likely to have more religious activities and a more favorable attitude toward religion. And there is evidence to suggest that in later maturity men are more apt to report that they feel happier.[23]

I was asked to talk to you about the individual and adult education. Trying to avoid the emptiness of an abstraction, I attempted to make myself visible as the kind of adult who comes to libraries—indeed, as the kind of person you also may be. To do this, I have roamed rather widely over the literature on adulthood. I have, of course, been unable to present an exhaustive description. For example, I have largely ignored the voluminous literature on group dynamics—the study of the individual as a member of small groups.

What, then, does all this add up to?

I can best answer by repeating the title of this piece: I am a slippery subject, infinitely complex, understandable primarily in terms of how you want to look at me.

I should like to conclude by offering, briefly, four generalizations which I believe are important to library workers as they focus attention on the abstraction termed "the individual."

1. The library is peculiarly suitable as a vast and varied resource for the infinitely complex human individuals who come to it. The library has no one bill of goods to sell. It perhaps can and should come close to being what Hutchins said a university cannot be—all things to all men. I wrote this paper at the Indiana sand dunes, on the southernmost tip of Lake Michigan. Northward, for more than a hundred miles, stretches this great lake. It occurred to me that there may be some point in analogyzing this lake to the Library—large or small.

In Lake Michigan, some people fish for entertainment; others fish for food. One man swims in it for fun; another sails on it for a living. The lake keeps us warmer in winter and cooler in the summer. And whether it be a sunset or a sunrise, a sand dune or an island, a rugged shore or a white beach, an object of beauty or a subject to study, the lake offers a variety of rich aesthetic and intellectual pleasure. Few would deny that Lake Michigan is something "good" in the lives of those it touches upon. Few would say it is "good" merely for its economic value. It is "good" not because it is "vocational," or "liberal," or "aesthetic," or because of its intellectual influence as against its entertainment value. It is good precisely because such dichotomies would be nonsense. It is good precisely because it is something of all these things to the individual.

---

[23] Ruth S. Cravan, et al., op. cit.

Similarly, it does not seem to make much sense to say that a library's primary purpose is an intellectual one and not entertainment, that it is more important for it to meet "social" needs than "aesthetic" ones, that a library is either "this" or "that." Like Lake Michigan, the library is good precisely because such dichotomies would be nonsense. It is good precisely because it is something of all of these things to the individual.

2. Secondly, within the large field of adult education, I believe the university and the library have one crucial role which distinguishes them from most other agencies of adult education: They both have a non-partisan role to fulfil.[24] Where we find the strongest and most effective (in terms of specific outcomes) adult education programs, the agencies are using education, not as an end in itself, but as a means to a partisan end, however socially useful that end may be. Thus, we find this to be true in the adult education activity of political parties, especially in Europe, in the programs of trade associations, or professional groups such as the American Medical Association, in the farm groups, in business and industry, and in labor education. Certainly a free society badly needs some agencies of adult education that treat education itself as its own reward, and the individuality of human beings as its primary concern. In short, as an agency of adult education, the library today is one of the few agencies that has no partisan "bill of goods" to sell. It is free to encourage individual growth for its own sake; the library therefore becomes one of the basic instruments by which a democratic society provides for the built-in possibilities of its own reconstruction.

---

[24] Careful study of this non-partisan role would, of course, lead us to include some other important agencies of adult education—such as museums, public school programs that are not strictly vocational, and some "consumer" programs such as Great Books.

3. A third generalization is that when we as adult educators think of "the individual," let us think of ourselves too. Here I reveal the deviousness of personalizing this paper by talking in terms of the editorial "I." For the resources of adult education, whether it be those of a university or a library, are for us too. They are not only for the "others" on the opposite side of the lectern or the librarian's desk. Adult education is for the adult educator as well as for the abstraction we call "the individual." Education is not a commodity which we, "the chosen," offer to the "unwashed." Education is a process of self growth, and the individual consumers of adult education must first of all be the adult educators themselves. We may all be fairly competent professionally, but in all humility can we claim to be more than partially educated?

4. And finally, a fourth generalization is closely related to the third. One important way, perhaps the most important way, for adult educators to "keep growing" is constantly to increase their understanding of human individuality and their sensitivity to the slipperiness of the subject once we reduce it from abstraction. We must, I believe, as professional people, resist the tendency to view our clients, patrons or students exclusively, or even primarily, in terms of our own frame of reference. If we adult educators became less rigid in our own attitudes, less absolutistic in our own concepts and values, and more humble about our own need for adult education, I believe we would see a sharp diminishing of the controversy over whether we should give adults—those "other people"—what they "want" or what they "really need."

THE UNIVERSITY EVENING COLLEGE

Few educators realize how influential the university evening college has become. This is especially true in urban universities where evening college enrollments are more than likely to equal or exceed those of all day colleges and divisions combined! Furthermore, most evening colleges are a financial asset to the university.

Hence, in quantitative and economic terms the influence of the evening college is great indeed.

The question now asked in the inner academic councils is: What is the quality of this influence? Is it good or bad for the university?

This question, of course, points to a more basic one: What are the proper functions of a university in a democratic, industrialized, urban society? This question must be met head-on, wrestled with, and eventually answered for each institution in terms of its own philosophy—if it has one.

Evening college operations are usually identified by one of several titles: Evening College; University College; Division or School of General Education. In a few cases the terms "Community College" or "Adult Education" are employed. Applied to evening programs, the term "Adult Education" has little meaning, or is only partially applicable, or is ambiguously used; sometimes it is scorned.

Facilities for the evening programs are usually either on the regular campus or at some central downtown location. This is one distinction between an evening college and adult residential colleges as the British know them, or between evening colleges and university extension programs as our state university people know them.

Evening college students are young adults whose principal occupation is other than that of a full-time student. They include housewives, especially an increasing number of older mothers whose children have been cut loose from the apron strings. However, the mean age of evening college students at present is about 28, although this average seems to be pushing upward. In the evening college, in terms of age, qualitative life experiences, and ability, the students are obviously more heterogeneous than those in day colleges. In the quantity of life experiences, they are a far more homogeneous group. Their curve of intellectual abilities appears to be a bi-modal one. That is, compared with a normal distribution curve for day students, evening students present one cluster below the average and one above it. And, as a number of studies have indicated, ability to learn does not significantly depreciate with age. In fact, Thorndike and others have shown that in terms of general ability to learn, the ages 25-35 are superior to childhood and equal or superior to adolescence (ages 14-18).

The trend gives the evening college an independent administrative status, although at present the picture is confused. The only generalization currently possible is that typically an evening college dean (often called Director) has independent status in some matters and not in others. He usually has powers equal to other university deans in matters of office management, budget, promotion, and non-credit programming; he has something less than complete say about scheduling and the assignment of teaching personnel, and is most often hemmed in on curriculum matters, academic discipline, and standards. For such things the evening dean must usually work out flexible modus operandi with day deans and department chairmen.

Somewhat more than half of the evening college faculty is drawn from day departments. Sometimes evening teaching is a part of the regular teaching load, but more often than not extra compensation is paid for evening teaching. Where it is part of the regular load there is a tendency to assign junior faculty members to evening classes, but where extra compensation is involved, senior faculty members usually seek evening assignments. For the vocational curriculums, commerce, public administration, social work, education, etc., "outside," part-time teaching talent is usually drawn from the community. In almost every case the daytime academic department retains at least a veto power over part-time appointments for the teaching of credit courses.

In the evening programs the major problems lie in the area of the curriculum. Here we find the thorny questions which challenge the university's conception of what its proper functions are. Such problems as academic standards and credit versus non-credit are areas of focus for conflicting philosophies. At present, the majority of evening college students appear to be motivated to go to school for utilitarian reasons. This takes the form of direct vocational preparation and an orientation toward college degrees as a fairly sure way of moving up the social and economic ladder.

But at present there are some trends of considerable importance: older people, less concerned about economic and social betterment and more concerned about the meaning of life, are coming back to the university in increasing numbers; some faculty members are beginning to see that such people cannot be helped with curriculum materials and teaching methods designed for adolescents; there seems to be an awakening of interest in liberal arts and humanistic studies, not as a "tie in sale" to a degree, but as something good in their own right; a few community groups are beginning to look to the university, not as a "service station" to meet presently perceived needs, but as an enormous pool for intellectual and spiritual nourishment; and perhaps most promising of all, the evening college movement seems to have a stirring of awareness that these trends may help the university evening college define what it really is.

At present, in this writer's judgment, the evening college is not sure what it is. It might best be identified as being at some point in a process of time; that is, as being at some point in the development of the urban universities' effort to define their social role. Currently, the evening college sits astride two attracting forces: The one pulls its attention and effort inward toward some of the older notions of the university as a conservator of knowledge, as an acquirer of knowledge, and as a trainer for specialized pursuits. The other force pulls the attention and effort of the evening college outward toward the community, where life, read about and examined laboratory-wise in the university, is lived in a full and confusing manner.

How then might the evening college define what it is and what it ought to do? The evening college can best define its purposes, not by a predominantly inward orientation toward academic subject matter, not by indiscriminate catering to the community's confusions, but by looking primarily to its adult clientele, who come attracted to know more about a life they are now living more fully than any adolescent can possibly experience.

A specialized, industrialized society tends to divide life into many, only thinly related experiences. Being itself highly specialized, the urban university reinforces rather than counteracts this divisive tendency. Thought-action; learning-doing; studying-working; these are aspects of an underlying dichotomy that could prove fatal to a free society. In short, the unity of life and the unity of knowledge are denied. More important, the idea of unity between life experience and knowledge is denied. And yet, at some points in history, it was precisely this idea that was the central idea of a university.

Hence, it may be the great opportunity, indeed the purpose, of the evening college again to establish or re-establish this idea by means of its educational activity for adults.

THE INTELLECTUAL CHALLENGE OF ADULT EDUCATION

I. The Need To See Adult Education as an Intellectual Challenge

Our research enables us to identify some common views of adult education held by college teachers. I am not citing types of teachers; these are types of views.

The first is the "hobby-lobby" view. This is the view of adult education as courses in arts, crafts, upholstering, woodworking, figurine painting and whatnot. The hobby advocates are viewed as zealots who have "taken over" adult education.

The second view of adult education I would call "Howtoism"—ranging from how to read faster, to such things as how a male can survive middle age with his superego intact, "how to be a woman," etc. If the "hobby lobby" view be associated with the YMCA's and the public school adult programs, "Howtoism" is the product of the age of Dale Carnegie, psychosomatics, Norman Vincent Peale, and Americans wanting to go abroad without appearing to be the kind of persons de Tocqueville said they were.[1]

A third view is that adult educators care only about "Giving 'em what they want." I suspect that this view assumes that college teachers really know what adults need.

A fourth view holds that adult education and group dynamics are synonymous. This view of course presumes a knowledge of what group dynamics is; it also presumes that there is something un-academic about the direct social action which group dynamics is often concerned with.[2]

---

[1] For a remarkable description of this "Howtoism" phenomena, I commend Dwight MacDonald's recent New Yorker piece on the subject (May 22, 1954).

[2] For a thoughtful statement on the role of the academic in social action research, see Ronald Lippitt's "Value-Judgment Problems of the Social Scientist in Action Research," a paper read at the 1950 meetings of the American Psychology Association.

A fifth is the "fly-tying" view. Those who hold this view voice loud alarm when a university adult program offers a course in "fly-tying" but are silent when the same course in the day college is offered as "Physical Education."

Adult education as intellectual entertainment is a sixth view growing out of the Lyceum and Chataqua movements and is currently found in attitudes toward the Great Books. Adult education is seen as the kind of thing that ladies with little feathers in their hats trap reluctant husbands into by appealing to their upward mobility drives.

Finally, I would cite the view of adult education, especially in the university, as a kind of academic "Siberia." The evening college or extension division is seen as a good place to park excess teaching personnel, to sentence a deviate to, or to relieve the pressure on the day department's tenure situation.

I am not suggesting either approval of or opposition to these views but pointing to their real existence. But, assuming that adult education is "here to stay," there seems to be an acute need for more intellectually satisfying view of adult education.

II. Why Should College Teachers Be Interested in Adult Education?

There are two compelling reasons, at different levels.

First, at what I call "the belly level," college teachers would do well to realize that adult education has become of crucial importance in the economic survival of the American university, and especially the private institution. Adult education programs make money, they produce an excess of income over direct expenditure. In most of the universities, adult enrollments exceed all the day division enrollments combined. In short, the jobs of many college teachers today depend upon adult enrollments. Purely in terms of "bread & butter" welfare, cynicism and disinterest would seem ill-advised. The argument, I believe, becomes more cogent when we realize the vast, potential, untapped market for adult education.

There is, fortunately, a second reason, on a higher level, for college teachers to be interested in adult education.

This reason is that adult education can be a tremendous intellectual challenge. The role of the adult education in our kind of society has the greatest implications for the conditions under which we work, live, and teach. As a respectable field of intellectual inquiry, adult education can well demand a professional commitment from at least some college teachers.

III. Three Areas of Intellectual Challenge

Adult education provides at least three main areas of intellectual challenge:

First, the adult himself is an interesting challenge. Existing research does not tell us much about adulthood. In this century we learned much about pre-natal and post-natal human development; from 1915 on we developed a rich literature of knowledge about early childhood and adolescence. Then recently, and for some strange reason, we skipped over the ages from 21 to 65 and got interested in the problems of an aging population. Since the war, gerontology has developed a considerable literature and has become recognized as a legitimate area of social, medical, psychological, and economic inquiry. Even the patent medicine ads attest to this: cod liver oil and Castoria have given way to Hadacol and Geritol. Interest in growth and glands have developed a new focus, not on the adolescent but on the aged. Child labor problems give way to "Ham & Eggs" schemes as political issues.

But "normal adulthood," especially the ages between 28 and 45 and the period of middle-age between 45 and 60, remains largely unexplored. Havighurst states that adulthood is the "terra incognita" of the social scientist.[3]

Havighurst proposes that one way to understand adults is to study the social roles which they must fulfil. He proposes ten such roles which most of us are expected to play—worker, parent, consumer of leisure time, etc. He wants to know about the qualitative changes within roles, and about the changing relationship between roles, as adults grow older. For example, in terms of the adult learning process it would seem of considerable interest to know more precisely what happens psychologically when one's children grow up, how consumption of leisure time change with age, the emotional affects of being "over the hill" physically, implications of a male adult's sudden awareness that his career has entered some kind of "levelling off" process.

---

[3] See Havighurst. The Social Roles of the Middle-Aged Person. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, No. 4 (1953). Chicago. The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

Some crucial changes occur between the ages of 38 and 50, a period Cyril O. Houle refers to as "the adolescence of maturity." Professor Houle, one of the few university people to make a scholarly commitment to adult education, points out three basic ways in which adulthood differs from youth in the human life cycle: (1) Adults have more experiences; (2) Adults have different kinds of experiences; and (3) The life experiences of adults are organized differently.

Dr. Raymond Kuhlen, Syracuse University psychologist, is another of the few who have made a professional commitment to studying adults. Summarized below are a few of his more important findings:[4]

The Learning Ability of Adults

Thorndike and others have pointed out that the peak age period of the ability to learn new things is between ages 20 and 26. But learning ability does not decline sharply with age; the drop is gradual. It is also more likely due to the factor of disuse rather than to any deterioration in organic powers. Furthermore, the data deal only with the peak of learning ability, which is not so important, perhaps, because people seldom have to call upon the maximum of their learning powers.

Age is only one factor in adult learning ability. Interest, motivation and a host of intangibles are the more important factors that make for learning and production. Hence, data suggest that a person's peak age for work production does not correspond to his peak age for learning (20 to 26), but occurs between the ages of 30 and 40.

Personality and Motivational Factors in Adulthood[5]

---

[4] Summary of remarks by Dr. Kuhlen, addressed to the Syracuse Faculty Seminar on Adult Education, Pinebrook, N. Y., May 21, 1954. This Seminar was jointly sponsored by the University and The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

[5] See Kuhlen and others. The Psychology of Human Development, and Pressy, Janney and Kuhlen, Life: A Psychological Survey, New York, Harpers, 1939. See also Harvey Lehman's Age and Achievement, published recently by Princeton University Press.

Kuhlen identified the following phenomena as being of major importance in adulthood:

1. Adults do not easily change their habits or attitudes, as Kallen has pointed out.[6] But Kuhlen remarks, "Despite this, it does seem that there is a growth-urge that persists throughout life."

2. Adult goals do change, needs and roles change. Vocational advancement seems to give way to cultural concerns. As an adult grows older, he appears to need "something more" than vocational satisfactions.[7] The kind of work he does seems to be quite influential in determining the changes that take place.

3. Adults want educational experiences that are realistically related to daily problems. They are more realistic than undergraduates. Short courses seem more desirable than semester-long courses. And there is evidence to suggest that adults seek educational experiences other than lectures, formal courses and the like.

4. As compared with adolescents, adults are subject to more conflicting pressures. For example, an adult may experience a pressure to go to school for job advancement, but at the same time experience pressure to be home at nights to help care for the children or a sick wife. Kuhlen suspects that the serious drop-out rate in adult education is due more to these conflicting pressures than to dissatisfaction with the quality of the educational experience.[8]

5. There comes a point at which adults view their future as now

5. There comes a point at which adults view their future as now. Attempts to "extend the future" occur by means of such things as:

a. Interest in geneology;

b. Identification with their children;

c. Increased concern with immortality. For example, whereas advancing age brings about a decrease in many kinds of activities, terested in such works as Riesman and Denney's books The Lonely Crowd and Faces in the Crowd, Eli Ginzberg's Occupational Choice, C. Wright Mill's White Collar and The Power Elite, Kallen's The Liberation of the Adult, the researches of Everett G. Hughes of Chicago, the work of Merton and others on the sociology of the professions, the studies of Alison Davis and his colleagues on the social class influences upon learning, the work of Lloyd Warner and his associates, and of course the classic Middletown studies of Robert and Helen Lynd. While much of this literature is of course relevant to your undergraduate teaching, it has some sharp implications especially for adult education.

---

[6] Horace Kallen. The Liberation of the Adult. Notes and Essays on Education for Adults, No. 7 (March, 1954), Chicago. The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

[7] See Pressy, Janney and Kuhlen. Op. cit., Ch. 7, pp. 220ff., also Peter E. Siegle, "Mountains, Plateaus, and Valleys in Adult Learning." Adult Education, IV: 4 (March, 1954).

[8] See James T. Carey, Why Students Drop Out: A Study of Evening College Students' Motivations, Chicago, The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1953, p. 18.

Finally, I cite a third area in which adult education offers us an intellectual challenge, the area of our own specialized subject matter. By and large, our subject matter in university adult education is imported lock, stock, and barrel from the day curricula. It is enmeshed in an elaborate system of rewards and punishments: credits, pre-requisites, sequences, degree requirements, exams and the like, and often fails, therefore, to truly involve the adult student.

Can the greatest that man has thought and said and done be "translated" into terms that are meaningful and relevant in adult education? Can this be done without prostituting scholarship? Can the teaching of humanities to adults be different without being inferior? We must look to the teachers for answers. Our main hope is that in struggling with the problems involved they will see adult education as a challenge, not a chore.

There is much talk of the "popularity" of science, psychology, and the like. There is much bemoaning the state of the humanities. An English teacher said to me last winter, "The only way I can get adults to take my evening college course on Hamlet is to bill it as a Freudian analysis. Then they come." Another faculty member complained that his course on "Adolescence" did not draw students until he packed the parents in by calling it "The Turbulent Teens."

But, should we really feel contemptuous of this kind of success? Is it necessarily un-scholarly to be meaningful and relevant? Every subject matter has its own dynamic as well as its own discipline. Knowledge is not static, new dimensions are ever appearing. Freud has given new dimensions to all of literature; he has introduced to the classics a new level of reality. Expanded world order imposes new subject matters upon political theory.

Dewey and Einstein have certainly added new conceptualizations to philosophy and science, Dewey by emphasizing the conflict or problematic situation as basic to learning and thinking, Einstein by pointing out how defective were Newtonian tools for the understanding of the universe. And in education itself, the American concept of universal education for all, at the least, demands that Cardinal Newman be re-read. As Whitehead pointed out, knowledge, like fish, does not keep fresh.

I have, I hope, pointed out the need for more intellectually satisfying concepts of adult education, and perhaps I have been successful in persuading you that such concepts can derive from the fascinating nature and needs of the American adult, from the "Big Changes" that our democratic and industrial society has produced and is producing, and finally from the challenge to make our subject matters, especially humanities, more meaningful and relevant.

THE NEED FOR THEORY IN ADULT EDUCATION

Adult education in the minds of most college and university people divides itself into three parts:

First, there is that aspect which provides academic programs that can lead to college degrees for persons who cannot come to the campus during the daytime. These programs are generally held to be a proper concern of the university, and it is believed that these programs should have the same objectives, content, methods, and standards as the day programs for full-time students. Otherwise, traditional college degrees will be cheapened.

Second, there is an aspect of adult education which most academic people feel concerns the university only to some extent. This is the provision of non-credit short courses, lecture series, institutes, and the like. This aspect also includes university extension work, some of which, under proper faculty safe-guards, can be accepted as "legal tender" for college degrees. Certificate programs would probably also fall into this category. In regard to this second aspect, academic people usually urge that the university should tread cautiously and be especially careful not to mix up too extensively the credit with the non-credit work. In uncharitable moments, this whole area is referred to as a kind of academic Siberia.

Third, there is that aspect of adult education which is generally held not to be the concern of the university. This includes what is being done by high schools, adult education councils, YMCA's, and a host of other noncollegiate agencies. This might be termed the typical view of adult education by most college and university people!

Now, insofar as adult education is merely day school at night, it already has bodies of theory to support it—or at least to argue about. But if adult education is something more than that, it deserves some theory of its own. Otherwise, adult education can never be appraised in its own terms.

Since at least some adult programs connected with institutions of higher education should be something more than merely day school at night, adult education needs to develop some theory of its own, which would give us something relevant to argue about. As it is, anyone in an evening college who wants to do anything new and exciting in adult education sooner or later finds himself defensively arguing in terms established by regular day college people for other purposes.

The proposition here advanced is that the main obstacle to better adult education is the lack, almost total lack, of an appropriate way of looking at adult education.

All about us lie observable events which we may call practices. These practices, if they are rational, derive from principles. These principles are back-stopped by concepts, or conceptual framework. And concepts are in turn derived by intellectual tools or habits, which might be called ways of looking at reality.

Most persons would agree that bodies of theory take form around principles and concepts. That is, principles and concepts get ordered and systematized; whereupon many practices and events are produced or justified. Bases for choices are thus established, objectives take shape, content is formed, and standards for evaluation emerge.

We should not, however, lose sight of the fact that behind the principles and concepts lie ways of thinking which give rise to them. Thus, such things as academic standards are not the product of curriculum committees; they begin way back in the intellectual habits (often unconscious ones) which govern academic decision making. And in the view of some observers, these habits to a large extent are generated in the graduate departments and learned societies.

As Phillipp Frank points out, the reason that Einstein exercised such a devastating effect in the area of physical theory was not primarily because he attacked the way physicists were doing things. It was not even because he attacked certain conventional principles and concepts such as those advanced by Newton. Such attacks the pace-setters of his day could cope with. What really made Einstein incomprehensible at first, what really stumped the experts, was his contention that their very tools of thought were defective. Until this was seen, there could be no communication between conventional theorists and "radical" Einstein.[1]

Freud faced a similar situation when he posed a whole new way of looking at human nature. It was simply impossible to communicate with Freud in terms of any medical theory then existing.

Adult education may or may not be of the magnitude suggested by the reference to Einstein, but the analogy may help us see that there do occur times in which ways of thinking have to be shifted to entirely new bases of reference. Such times appear historically to occur when very large events, having evolved over a period of time, suddenly achieve a degree of fruition in which they struggle for recognition as identities in their own right. Such events, growing slowly, have the effect of sneaking up on us. All of a sudden, here they are! There is no adequate way to describe them, much less to understand them, and still less to appraise them.

Does adult education deserve to be looked at as an event of such magnitude? We cannot scoff our way to a lighthearted answer. After all, there are thirty million Americans who attend some kind of formally organized adult education activity. This is greater than 10 times the number who attend all the day colleges and universities combined!

Today it may well be that the event we call "adult education" is but a new recognition of an old idea, that a new awareness is suddenly upon us. Adult education appears to be an institution struggling to get a form for itself, an identity for its own. We might understand this better, if we recall that early in this century the American high school also experienced a new recognition of an old idea and went through a struggle to get a form for itself. Breaking from the European tradition and from the demands imposed by the universities, the American high school has finally emerged with an identity and rationale of its own.

A rewarding experience is to try to describe to a relatively unsophisticated European exactly what an American high school is. You will be unable to communicate to him until you have first created a conceptual frame of reference, a set of terms, almost a new language, which enables you intelligibly to describe to him what you are talking about. You may surprise yourself to find, first, that your description is little in terms of a preparatory system for a scholarly career (this the European could understand), and, second, that you really can describe the American high school in its own terms because it has developed its own reason for being, whether we like it or not.

---

[1] Phillipp Frank, Einstein: His Life and Times. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947. Speaking of Einstein and Schroedinger, one of the first to understand the vital point at which Einstein's attack aimed, Frank states: "There was an immediate understanding between the two men without any long explanations, and an agreement on the manner in which they could act toward each other without first having to call upon Kant's categorical imperative." (p. 114.)

Hence, we return to our main proposition that adult education also needs its own reason for being, some theory of its own, and that this cannot be derived until we establish an appropriate way of looking at adult education.

This paper has no intention of overreaching itself. It will not presume to state what the appropriate way of looking at adult education is. It has the less ambitious goal of merely trying to awaken further interest in the need for theory in adult education.

The final point to be made, then, is to show a bit more concretely how adult education, especially that aspect which is connected with institutions of higher education, is boxed in by a frame of reference that is in part at least inappropriate for adult education.

First: Let us look at practices. Whatever theory they hold, most people think of higher education as having to do with such things as books, formal classrooms, courses, grades, credits, requirements, sequences, degrees, and the like.

Behind these practices lie certain principles. One typical of the genus is that learning must necessarily be partly unpleasant, at least at first, because learning is some kind of therapeutic or medicinal prescription given by "doctors" who know what sick patients (adolescents) need in order to get well (grow up). Now especially for adolescents there is enough truth in this kind of principle so that anyone who flatly argues to the contrary can easily be made to look silly, but already lurking around this principle is the suggestion of a dichotomy: teacher—learner; sick—well; educated—uneducated; leader—follower. In fact, there is more than a little trace of feeling that there is education and then "other" life experiences.

Such a principle grows, of course, out of certain concepts. One such concept is that an educated man is one whose deficiencies have been well patched up. Here again, we shall look foolish, if we argue that there is no truth in this concept. There is truth in it. From research and experience we now know that young children and adolescents do need certain things which formal education can provide. This concept is quite obviously also true, at least in part, for adults. But we need to remind ourselves that research-wise, adulthood is what Havighurst calls the terra incognita for the social scientist. Havighurst proposes that in considering the needs of individuals, the emphasis shifts from growth to function. That is, in adult education we might ask, not what an individual ought to have prescribed in order for him to grow up, but what he needs if he is successfully to fulfil the social roles which adulthood requires of him.[2]

Such a concept—in this case the concept of function or social role—is an example of a new way of looking at the needs of adults. There are other ways, of course, ways of looking anew at what subject-matter fields can do for adult non-specialists, and ways of fashioning more clearly the current fuzzy thinking about community needs. The point, however, is that many traditional ways of looking at "needs" make either less sense or non-sense when applied to adult education. A matured, adult person appears to be something far more challenging than one who is called "educated" if he has a degree, or "not educated" if he does not.

Dean Paul McGhee of New York University recently posed this gem: "If you talk to an eminent chemist or astronomer about poetry, you may discover that he belongs to the masses."

All of us belong to the masses so far as adult education is concerned. Few would claim to be more than partly educated. Few would deny that the education goals of a free society must be congenial with the Henry Adams assertion that education and life are coterminous.

If knowledge is unified, life and educational experience are not less so. A "grade" or a "course" or a "degree" is no panacea for the educational needs of adults. Indeed, such rubrics of the so-called higher learning may often have little or no relevance to those things which an adult needs and a university is best able to supply. And yet we do little but view collegiate learning as something which teachers impart to our junior citizenry.

---

[2] Robert J. Havighurst, Social Roles of the Middle-Aged Person: A Method of Identifying the Needs of Adults, Notes and Essays on Education for Adults. No. 4 (March, 1953). The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

Learning principles and educational practices more appropriate for adults will emerge only when adult education—like medical and legal education, like the American high school, like childhood education—develops a reason for its existence. In short, adult education needs a theory of its own, if it is to discover what it really is.

EMERGING THEORY IN ADULT EDUCATION

Soon after suggesting the need for theory in adult education (8) I realized that at least three theoretical formulations have recently been taking shape. These appear as "clusters" deriving from philosophical positions which of course are not new. What is new is the now perceptible evidence that age-old philosophic controversies are being applied to theory and practice in adult education. This seems to be a healthy sign that the adult education movement is maturing intellectually, moving toward a full-fledged professional status in its own right.

The purpose of this paper is to assert the identity of these three theoretical positions, to suggest some names and reading references which illustrate each position, and to pose a few questions for discussion.

Three Theoretical Formulations

1. The "Great Books" Concept. The goal of adult education should be the goal of liberal education. The goal of liberal education is to teach man to think about the "great issues," which are: "What is our destiny?" "What is a good life?" "How can we achieve a good society?" "What can we learn to guide us through the mazes of the future from history, philosophy, literature, and the fine arts?" (4, p. 56) These great issues are recorded in the great books of the western world. This record is "the great conversation." Hence, in "the great conversation" we have neatly wrapped in one packet the aim, content, organization, and method (dialectic) of adult education.*

2. The Community Approach. The goals of adult education should be

---

*References: Hutchins (4). Here, pp. 1-6, he defines liberal education; in ch. VII, pp. 52-57, he argues why adult education should be liberal education and why liberal education is especially appropriate for adult education.

Adler (1), when he addresses himself to adult education, springs no surprises; he talks just as Mortimer Adler always does.

social actions. What actions? Effective leadership will enable face-to-face community groups to decide what actions are best and how to implement them. Sheats et al. (9), endorsing the AEA stand reported by Pell (7) report: "Social action on behalf of reasoned social change is the functional raison d'etre of a modern adult education movement. Mere extension of personal knowledge on the part of individual adults does not constitute an adult education movement." (p. 496)

3. The Individual as Goal. The goal of adult education should be the education of the individual. This theoretical position seems to be making its appearance in the adult education literature primarily as a reaction against the community or group approach. Some feel it is the humanist's warning about what certain social scientists are doing to the adult education movement. Others have characterized this position as a revolt by "inner-directed" men who resist being "group-ed" and manipulated in the name of "democratic social action." This position takes no less a stand against the teaching of subject matter as the goal than it does against social action as the aim of adult education. It asserts that "in the end, for the adult educator there is only the individual, the individual who seeks education; . . . [this is] the idea of the importance of the human person in an open society." (5)*

A "Nutshell" Critique

Of the three theoretical positions, the "Great Books Concept" is the most systematized. Its basic postulates, assumed a priori, are fixed and clear; its terms do not wiggle about and change meaning. The formulation has a high degree of consistency within itself. It is resistant to change, either from within or without.

The "Community Approach" appears to be an off-shoot of Dewey's emphasis on social and action. There are two principal difficulties in trying to understand this position. First, the spokesmen for this position do not expend much time or energy intellectualizing or verbalizing about their basic assumptions. For example, when I asked Miles Horton if he had anything in writing I could use for this memorandum, he replied:

I have often thought about writing out the basic reasons for this program, but I have been so busy "doing" that I have had no time for "writing."

---

*References: Paul A. McGhee (5) and (6).

Speaking of their position, Sheats and his colleagues state: "Often the philosophic implications are not verbalized but the choices made among possible alternatives, and the procedures used in the management and operation of adult education activities, reveal even more vividly than words the philosophic commitments involved." (9, p. 15)

Thus, the first difficulty is that their basic assumptions have to be inferred. A second difficulty stems from the first. The inferring of basic assumptions in this position is enormously complicated because the terms tumble about and collapse into each other. Their meaning constantly changes. Everything in the system is related but in a fluid manner. Even the relationships are relative.

The position that the individual is the goal also appears to stem from Dewey. But here the emphasis is less on social and action and primarily on individual growth for its own sake. And the good society must be open-ended because the growth of an individual should never be boxed in. This position, it seems to me, is really the most radical one because there is no way of predicting where it may lead. In fact, the unpredictable is itself made a positive value. This position assumes that a well educated individual (one who keeps on growing) will ipso facto create a good society.

Questions for Discussion

The theme of this paper might be stated as follows: Emerging theories about the goals of adult education can be identified; they are worth identifying so that we can discuss what they really mean; when we understand what these theoretical positions really mean, we will achieve more intelligent appraisal of the practices and programs that follow from them. In short, while it may never be desirable to reach consensus on the goals of adult education, it does seem to make sense to talk intelligently about the problem of the goals of adult education.

The following questions may be helpful:

1. What are the basic assumptions which each position holds about: the nature of human beings; the nature of the good society; the nature of truth; and the nature of learning?

2. For each position, how might one hook up its basic assumptions to the aims, content, methods and organization of learning experiences in specific programs?

3. Are these positions talking the same language? That is, do the terms mean the same even when the words—such as "individual" —are the same?

4. Should the adult education movement strive for a unifying philosophy and goal, or for the development of many conflicting philosophies and goals?

5. Should a leader of adult education leaders make a commitment to a philosophic position, or should he strive to be "above" the brawling in the manner befitting (some would say) the scholar?

6. Scanning Houle's (3) "guiding rules for the future" for universities in adult education, where can he be placed in relation to these three theoretical positions? (See also the Chicago philosophy [largely Houle's, I think] on adult education (2).)

Bibliography

1. Adler, M. J. "Adult Education," Journal of Higher Education. XXIII, No. 2. (Feb. 1952)
2. Chicago. "The University College and Adult Education," Fall 1953 catalogue; pp. 6ff.
3. Houle, C. O. Introduction to Universities in Adult Education, a UNESCO publication.
4. Hutchins, R. M. The Great Conversation. Vol. 1. Great Books of the Western World. Chicago. Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. 1952. Harpers Library & Harpers Reserve, Open Shelf: PN 6013, G8, v.1.

   I shall also try to enclose a copy of The Gadfly, publication of the Great Books Foundation. This copy contains an excerpt from Hutchins' new book, The University of Utopia.
5. McGhee, Paul A. A School for Optimists. Chicago. The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. 1953. Pp. 1-5, and 18-25.
6. "Three Dimensions of Adult Education." Paper presented at the Thirty Sixth Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., October 8-9, 1953. (This will probably appear in the next issue of The Educational Record.)
7. Pell, Orlie. "Social Philosophy at the Grass Roots—The Work of the AEA's Committee on Social Philosophy." Adult Education: II; No. 4. (April 1952, pp. 124-127.)
8. Schwertman, J. B. "The Need for Theory in Adult Education." School and Society. Vol. 77. No. 2010. (June 27, 1953) Pp. 405-408.
9. Sheats, Jayne & Spence. Adult Education: The Community Approach. New York. The Dryden Press, 1953.

ADULT EDUCATION—MEANS OR END

The problem inherent in the term "adult education" is the problem of purpose. What ought we to try to do? Shall we educate for terminal goals—"Truth," "Reality," "Goodness"? For "Change"? For "Social Reform"? To achieve specific group interests? Or for what?

It is the value assumption in this presentation that adult education should not lay down a set of purposes. One group's terminal goals are but mediate or intermediate goals for another group. Some agencies of adult education pursue ends which often conflict with ends pursued by other adult education agencies. One man's solution turns out to be another man's problem, etc.

For specific agencies of adult education, it is of course useful to state a set of purposes, but for adult education as a whole, there is only the on-going problem of purposes.

First, agencies of adult education are usually parts of a heterogeneous group of social institutions. Thus, labor education sections are parts of unions whose primary interests are in a wide variety of social, economic, and political issues. In like manner, trade associations, industries, and professional groups have their education departments or committees which further their larger and primary ends. The Advisory Council is the basic educational unit of the Ohio Farm Bureau, whose primary purposes are not unlike those of a labor union, although the position on issues differs because some important interests of the farmer and the industrial worker differ. Even public schools, colleges, and universities, whose main business is education, rarely regard their adult education divisions as more than secondary adjuncts.

Thus we are led to a second generalization: in this country, education for adults is neither the major activity nor the major purpose of most of the social institutions that maintain adult education agencies; in the United States, adult education is carried on primarily by agencies and institutions whose main purposes are not adult education.

A third generalization may evoke some doubt about the degree to which it is true. But, by and large, one can defend the proposition that the agencies having the strongest adult education programs are those agencies most firmly committed to ends that are partisan, specialized, or utilitarian, however socially desirable those ends may be. By "strong" programs is meant "successful" programs in the quantitative sense of drawing a relatively large and steady clientele, and in the sense of the effective achievement of specific goals. Thus, insurance firms support successful training programs for underwriters; unions find courses and curricula for shop stewards and union business agents useful; co-operative societies are convinced that strong educational programs for members advance the cause of the co-operative movement; and in the public schools specific "how to do it" courses (such as "upholstering") are "sure fire" in drawing satisfied customers who learn something "useful;" in evening colleges the "meal ticket" courses and curricula are the staples in the adult programs. We would also do well to note that the adult education programs of European political parties are, in the terms of the partisan goals of those parties, probably the strongest programs of adult education we have seen in modern history. In short, there seems to be a direct relationship between program success and such factors as training, indoctrination, and service to partisan and utilitarian ends, and an inverse relationship between program success and education, "culture," and arts for their own sake.

A fourth generalization therefore seems to follow logically and to be supported by our studies: namely, that the agencies, persons and programs desiring to serve unorganized educational consumers are often worried and confused because they attract so few, or because they see such inadequate tangible results. The Great Books Foundation retains the vision of serving hundreds of thousands but attracts only about 20,000; courses in literature, art, and philosophy are as rare in a trade association as they are in a union program; co-operative societies and farm councils may offer folk dancing, economics, and international relations, but usually within a broader utilitarian context; and the schools and universities generally display the anxiety that the purer "cultural" offerings, in order to "go over," will have to be watered down to either a "how to do it" or a sheer entertainment level.

From the illustrations noted, one may infer for analysis a three-point continuum along which to place various adult education programs.[1]

At the one extreme can be placed programs which are partisan or utilitarian in their aims, specific and practical in their content and organization, limited in the organizational clientele appealed to, and which evaluate their investments in pragmatic terms, i.e., how well the programs have paid off in furthering the welfare of "our" group or "our" specific goals. This group of programs and agencies would have to include churches, unions, trade and industry groups, professional groups, certain voluntary agencies such as the American Legion, Civil Defense, and the Red Cross, and the specialized, vocational, and professional programs of the formal institutions of schooling at all levels. One would also be forced to include regular diploma and degree programs because they are offered, taught, and regarded by our society primarily as a means of "bread and butter" and social advancement.

One thing should be made clear: this extreme on the continuum is not to be invidiously regarded. These agencies and programs are, by and large, important, useful, and essential in our kind of society.

The mid-point on the continuum is more difficult to describe because it partakes of both extremes. Here perhaps belong the co-operative societies, the farm bureau programs, the League of Women Voters, the PTA's, institutions such as the Highlander Folk School, some of the less formal (non-credit) programs of schools and colleges, and perhaps certain types of adult education programs of unions, trade groups, industry, and the churches.

Characteristics of this mid-point seem to be: commitment to broad social goals or "values;" appeal to a clientele somewhat broader than an organizational clientele; program format, content, and organization that departs, often radically, from traditional educational forms; and an interest in evaluation that does not look unfavorably upon intangible outcomes that are generally defined as being "in the public interest."

---

[1] Not being sure where libraries, museums, and certain voluntary organizations would be placed in this analysis, I will have to omit these very important agencies of adult education, and hope that competent persons in these fields may be impelled to discuss for our benefit how they see their role in terms of adult education as means or end.

At the other extreme of the continuum is the "art for art's sake" kind of program. By and large, these are the kinds of programs fostered by the Fund for Adult Education—Great Books, American Foundation for Political Education, the American Heritage Program, community discussion programs, and the like. In this group one would have to place the large number of unorganized groups devoted to such things as play reading, perhaps some of the women's clubs, and certain new concepts in university adult education such as Chicago's Basic Program, Louisville's "Neighborhood College," and some of the programs of New York University's Division of General Education.

The characteristics of these programs seem to be: aims that are generally, but not always, regarded as synonymous with the aims of general or liberal education; in content they draw upon the great traditions of subject matter learning; they are non-sequentially organized; they are not credit-oriented; they are open to the general adult public; evaluation of outcomes, not often systematically done, is made in terms of the abstraction called "the individual."

Adult Education—Abstraction or "Movement"?

Adult education is neither an abstraction nor a "movement." It is not an abstraction because there is an organization, the Adult Education Association. But few would claim that adult education in this country is a "movement." When it comes to deeper social issues and problems it has no shared goals; it can hardly be claimed that its members are a dedicated group.

Yet—in the United States adult education can, and probably should, strive to become a significant social movement. It can do so, not in the European sense of becoming identified with an ideology or an economic class, but in ways appropriate to the American ideal of the open society.[2]

It must help make the open society a reality. This is what adult education can stand for. The main obstacle to creating an adult education movement around this ideal lies not in the inadequacy or unreality of the ideal, but in the possibility that many adult education agencies do not really believe in it. It is about time that we in adult education found out whether or not this is true. Two questions, if answerable, would quickly force a showdown:

---

[2] At present, there appears to be a dangerous tendency, especially among intellectuals, to deride the open society as a "myth." But even if, in reality, it is a myth, the ideal of it need not be. What better has history to offer us?

First: Would agencies which claim to do adult education permit, indeed encourage, study and discussion activities which subject organizational goals and institutionalized norms to constant rational inquiry?

That is, would these agencies dare encourage distrust of the goals their educational programs seek to achieve?[3] Could industry afford to support the kind of education which tends to make consumers immune to certain kinds of advertising? To what extent does the union program of adult education try to help the union member to think for himself? In certain religious and political groups can error be tolerated in the face of declared Truth? And in the university itself, is not the value of many liberal arts courses seen primarily as a "meal ticket" value, thus in a strange way preventing the spirit of inquiry from operating against even its own subject matter?

These are tough questions to level at agencies which aim at specialized and partisan ends, but they must be asked if adult education is to find out if it really has anything to dedicate itself to. For when organizational ends are monolithic and immune to rational inquiry and reconstruction, when organizational clientele become bound by any "party line," when "educational" programs, however unwittingly, contribute to the bondage, then at very least these programs are not "educational" but something else.

A second question is almost of equal importance: Will Americans support for the general adult consumer those liberal education programs which cannot demonstrate immediate possibilities of "paying off"?

While there is some evidence, though far from conclusive, that we can create new adult audiences for liberal education, there is almost no evidence that American communities are prepared to provide adequate financial support for this kind of education. It appears that for some time to come programs of liberal adult education will not pay their own way unless they are hooked up with utilitarian aims that are explicit. Many people, including the writer, would like to see further experimental efforts to build the necessary financial support into the public tax structure, as it is to some extent in the city of Louisville and in the junior college system of California. It could be that liberal education for adults is as essential to our communities as is policing and garbage collecting, perhaps even more so. Certainly within the vast activity of adult education there is room for programs which are not connected with groups and organizations that are committed to partisan and specialized goals.

---

[3] Here the word "distrust" is used in a special sense—in the way Horace M. Kallen recently used it when he said: "Doubt and distrust are not the opposite of trust or the absence of trust, but the conflict of trustings."—from "Human Beings and Psychological Systems," Remarks at the Dedication of the Perception Demonstration Center, Princeton University, March 6, 1954.

Implications for the Adult Education Association

This analysis and these questions clearly suggest certain implications for the Adult Education Association.

There can be no denying that at one level the AEA must continue to be a practical service agency, responsive to its heterogeneous membership. It is a nerve center, a secretariat, a source of information and help, not only for professional adult educators, who, by and large, are not powerful, but also for the social action agencies and voluntary organizations which are powerful.

At a higher level it can be a means of posing the crucial questions, a matrix for the emergence of research and knowledge, a means of encouraging all of its member organizations to provide the methods and means for individuals, however deviationist they may seem, to be heard and to be effective.

At the highest level, the AEA can be a national forum for conflicting aims and philosophies. It cannot, as Blakely urged,[4] evolve a philosophy and a goal. But it can be the means by which passion-rousing social and professional interests are subjected to rational discussion, a matrix for an on-going dialectic of conflicting philosophies. At this level the AEA becomes an organization indispensable to a democratic society, which to survive must contain the built-in possibilities for its own constant reconstruction.

---

[4] R. J. Blakely, "Adult Education Needs a Philosophy and a Goal." Adult Education, III, 1, November, 1952.

CONTINUING EDUCATION AND THE PROBLEM OF EXCELLENCE

If we ask whether our universities should bear some responsibility for the continuing education of our adult citizens, I suppose most of us would tend to answer "certainly."

But this is not an adequate answer. It is not adequate because the question is asked in the abstract; it is, for example, asked without reference to such questions as: What other important commitments get penalized if the university invests heavily in continuing education?

It is the kind of question we are sometimes asked about the education of our children. Would we like the elementary school to teach French and modern dance? Most of us would probably say, "Yes . . . but not at the expense of reading and arithmetic."

Decisions about educational purposes involve the problem of choosing between alternative "goods," all of which may be socially desirable. Hence, in tackling the question of a university's responsibility for continuing education in the community, I believe we can save time in the long run by admitting that basically we are faced with a philosophic problem.

It seems appropriate, therefore, to suggest that we discuss the question with reference to our own general image of what a university is. Prominent in my image of a university is the notion that a university should be a social institution that stands for excellence. Hence, I choose to focus my remarks on "Continuing Education and the Problem of Excellence."

This focus is chosen for two reasons: first, in the abstract I think all of us are for excellence, just as we are for peace, truth, and motherhood. At least, a concern for excellence provides a beginning point for discussion, a point of agreement for the teacher and administrator. Second, my experience with university faculty members leads me to believe that skepticism about continuing education derives primarily from a concern about excellence, usually expressed as an anxiety over "standards," a term of many meanings, most of them imprecise.

The truth is that the American university does not always signify the first-rate in their undergraduate and graduate programs. Some would lay the blame on the university's attempt to do too much for too many. I would prefer to state it somewhat differently: While part of the difficulty may be that the university tries to do too much, we must remember that ours is a society committed to education that is universal, secular and tax supported. Given this commitment, we will necessarily have universities that must fulfil many roles and do many things. Our question might then better be: Whatever the university must do, does it do it well? I believe the best way for a university to avoid having to do too much is to build in the community the reputation that it will not consider anything unless it can produce a first-rate performance. The finest hour for continuing education may come when it points the way to rescuing higher education from some of the low standards of the day divisions.

If this paper has a special plea, it is that whoever goes to the university for whatever purpose, for whatever activity the university chooses to offer, he has a right to expect not only something better than he could get elsewhere, but the best there is.

So much for the polemic; let us now look at what I am calling "the problem of excellence." In the remaining time I should like to deal with three questions: (1) What is meant by the term "excellence"? (2) How do we specify excellence for educational activity at the university level? (3) In terms of continuing education, what specifically does excellence demand of the subject matter specialist?

To ask one to state what he means by excellence is to ask him for his philosophy. It is good that this should be made as clear as possible and I am glad to do so. I shall be very brief, simply trying to communicate my basic point of view rather than trying systematically to develop that point of view.

In a nutshell, my philosophic assumption is: That each area of human activity has its own excellence. This excellence is made up not of one thing, but of a number of things, usually related.

The ability to throw is one of the things that makes for excellence in playing basebell; but there are other things a ballplayer must also be able to do well. Skill in counterpoint is one criterion of excellence in musical composition. And so on.

And now I move closer to the main point I want to make about continuing educational activity in the university: Different human activities have different kinds of excellence.

The ability to throw a baseball is no more a criterion of excellence in composing music than is skill at counterpoint necessary to playing baseball. Knowledge is usually more important than physical strength as a requirement of the good research man in the Bureau of Fisheries, while physical strength is usually more important than knowledge when judging the excellence of a man's performance in lifting a drowning child from the water.

We are still faced, I realize, with the question: Is one kind of excellence always as good as another kind of excellence? One of my most respected colleagues answers the question for himself by asserting that Shakespeare brilliantly taught will always be better than plumbing brilliantly taught. I am not so sure.

I recall a time in late February 1945 when a group of us were pinned by German gunfire in the basement of an inn in the gutted Alsatian town of Bitchie. The toilets were intact but the plumbing system was badly shot up. No one dared stick his head out of the basement and we were pinned there for several days with no immediate prospect of getting out. I knew something about Shakespeare, but thank God some of the other men knew something about plumbing. They rigged up the flushing system and made it work, so help me, by connecting the water tanks to huge casks of fine Alsatian wine! In this situation, faced with this problem, and with the purpose of healthful survival, I cannot concede that Shakespeare is always better than plumbing.

On the philosophic ramifications of all this we could argue well into the night. My only purpose here is to make clear my current bias as background for my diagnosis of the basic problem in continuing education at the university level. I would state the problem this way: University faculty members tend to judge all adult education activity in terms derived from and applied to the regular degree-oriented course sequences in the graduate and undergraduate programs.

Whether a School of Journalism is more important to a community than a Division of Community Development is, of course, for the university to decide, usually at budget-making time. My point is not to argue the relative merits of these two kinds of activity.

My point is a much simpler one: namely, that if a university chooses to undertake both a Journalism School and a Community Development Program, it is manifestly unfair to judge the excellence of the one in terms of standards established for the other. In short, continuing education has, at very least, the right to be judged in its own terms. This point is utterly crucial when applied to the obvious differences between formal classroom activity on the campus, and the other activities in the continuing education program.

Here, in my judgment, lies the great obligation of the adult educator: he must think through, experiment, reconstruct his purposes and methods in accordance with bodies of theory and programs of activity worked out in their own terms, not in terms established for adolescents in the day divisions. If, therefore, continuing education can establish its own criteria of excellence it can add to, not detract from, the prestige of the university. It can be different without being inferior. Indeed, continuing education can be different and be superior.

I turn now to the second question: How do we specify excellence for educational activity at the university level? I approach this question by reaffirming what most of you would agree are the three general purposes of the university: teaching, research, and specialized services to society.

All three of these purposes are operative in continuing education. The teaching function applied to continuing education is well established in the American university system. For example, few would deny that medical education is itself a form of "continuing" education. Of the three purposes, the application of the research function to continuing education is perhaps the most neglected. But that is another story. I want to concentrate for a moment on the function of providing specialized services to the community. Here persists the greatest need to evolve criteria for excellence, for we know that it is absurd to expect the university to be all things to all men. It obviously cannot be that and still be a symbol of excellence. It seems to me that this brings us to another crucial question in our concern for continuing education and the problem of excellence: How can the university maintain excellence in the face of constant pressures to expand service in the community?[1]

I am not pessimistic about the ability of a university to cope with this problem. I would suggest that a number of helpful questions might be asked about any continuing education activity, though I am sure you might formulate a better set for yourself. The point is that in this era of expanding educational services to adults in our communities, we have not yet tried very hard to formulate any criteria to guide us in selecting what the university ought and ought not to do.

Here are some of the questions which I feel would help enhance the university's reputation for excellence:

1. Could another social agency carry on the educational activity as well as the university, or could the university do it better? Note that this question implies that a university must not only be able to do the activity as well as another social agency, it must be able to do it better. This point is illustrated by the theoretical man's answer to the practical farmer who said: "I want my son's education to be practical—like teaching him how to milk a cow." "That's all well and good," said the theoretical man, "but I'd like my son to be able to do something more than what a calf can do better."

2. Not only can the university do this activity well, but given our state of knowledge and resources, can the university do the best possible job that can be done?

This question differs from the first one in this way: Sometimes a university can do a job better than any other social agency, but it still cannot do the job very well. What I am trying to emphasize here is that a university will eventually suffer unless, in almost every instance, it does a first-rate job of whatever it undertakes to do.

---

[1] As a side issue to this paper, I would like to raise the question as to whether the really important pressures arise from without or from within the university. Sometimes people within the university show insight and initiative about a community need and that is good; however, I believe that sometimes a doubtful expansion of university service results from a powerful administrator riding a pet hobby, or from a faculty member or faculty group that desires to build a little empire around a subject matter enthusiasm.

3. *Is the subject matter of the activity complex*? It seems to me it is precisely because the subject matters of law and medicine are complex that they have won an honored place in the university. And it is because some aspects of commerce education involve merely "how-to-do-it" mechanics that commerce education has not yet won the status of the medical and law school within the university family.

I submit that this question of the complexity of subject matter has much to commend it to the adult educator. Take the community problem of juvenile delinquency. There are a number of levels at which this problem can be tackled. At one level, and I hope I can avoid the connotation that this is a "less good" level, Teen Canteens can be organized and operated. At another level, intelligent laws need to be drafted; parent education needs to be undertaken; research in adolescent behavior must be done. Each level of activity can have its own excellence, as I remarked before. The point here is that a university's responsibility for continuing education is directly related to the level of complexity of the subject matter involved. The higher the level of complexity, the greater the university's responsibility.

4. *To what extent is there a principal concern for intellectual development*? This question flatly implies that excellence of university level activity is very largely a matter of encouraging the growth of intellectual power. The university, above all other community agencies, should provide emphasis on the value of reason.

But, even granting this rather rigid-sounding premise, I do not come out with rigid notions about programs of continuing education—as do, for example, Mr. Adler and Mr. Hutchins. To me, subject matter content *per se* is not necessarily liberating, in the sense of liberating man from ignorance. For me it is not a matter of one subject being liberal while another subject is not. The opposite of liberal is *not* vocational; the opposite of liberal *is* illiberal.

Therefore, in judging the excellence of a program of continuing education, should we not ask: To what extent will this tend to make men free? To what extent will it liberate adults from ignorance and from the restrictions imposed by intellectual potential that is largely untapped, undevel-

2

oped, and unused?

All this, I would maintain, seems to argue not necessarily for the abolition of certain programs a university must undertake, but it does argue for a re-examination of those programs in terms of how much they tend to encourage the development of intellectual ability.

5. Will the educational activity offer possibilities for opening to adults new and major vistas of social, spiritual, and esthetic experience? While it is true that almost any socially desirable learning activity can make people less provincial, the excellence of university-level learning activity must be judged, it seems to me, in terms of whether the experience of the learner can be expanded in major ways.

Therefore, in terms of this criterion, if we can call it that, it seems proper for us to ask whether in usual circumstances learning to loft boats opens vistas of as comparable magnitude as would the reading and understanding of "King Lear."

But let us not get too stuffy about learning activity *per se*. For, again, excellence is a matter of degree, circumstance, and purpose. For a Shakespearian expert who knows "King Lear" from A to Z, I can conceive of a course in boat lofting as being more liberating than a rereading of the play. Thus, if boat lofting can be taught as something first-rate, it can do a university honor by helping certain individuals to undergo a liberating experience of major proportions.

6. Will the educational activity enable the university to gain new insights and knowledge? This question implies, quite rightly I think, the application of the university's research function to continuing education.

Can the university learn anything by undertaking certain activity? I think it can in most cases, especially in terms of increasing knowledge about human behavior and the complexities of inter-human and social arrangements.

7. My final question is: Will the educational activity develop community leadership? Granting that regular degree-oriented academic programs, if done well, will do their share in the production of intelligent community leaders, it is this question that seems especially relevant to the excellence of continuing education for our communities. I like Dean

Stoke's[2] point about there being no need for continuing education if undergraduate education is done well enough. But given the highly segmented and specialized kind of "utilitarian" education in the undergraduate colleges, we are not producing adequate leadership for democracy. Hence, the university has a responsibility to give community leaders, especially business and professional people, the kind of liberating education they never had time to get in their undergraduate days.

Programs that merely teach skills and programs that merely help solve specific social problems are, by and large, less a measure of excellence in higher education than are programs which develop the leadership which will enable a community to identify and solve its own problems. Skill training, therefore, seems to me to be only one aspect of the university's responsibility.

I am tempted to summarize by asking you to think over two different kinds of continuing education in the light of these seven questions.

One kind of program is the regular degree-oriented curriculum with an academic major in some respected field such as literature or philosophy; the other is a community development program, which in many ways is a most radical concept of the function of a university.

As your eye runs over these seven questions, I would hope that four generalizations would become clear: First, by and large all seven questions can be applied to judging the excellence of teaching philosophy or of doing community development. Second, some of the questions seem equally relevant to both kinds of programs. For example, the subject matter of philosophy and the subject matter of community development seem to me to be equally complex. That is, both are asking, in the deepest sense, the question of what a good society is. Third, other of the questions seem to be relevant in different ways to each kind of program. For example, while intellectual development may be more relevant to philosophy, the development of community leadership may be more relevant to community development. Fourth, in both kinds of programs the excellence of each can be appraised in its own terms.

Finally, and briefly, I would like to deal with the third question I raised: In terms of continuing education, what specifically does excellence demand of the subject matter specialist? It demands, I think, that the subject matter specialist realize that continuing education is for him too. It seems to me that excellence of teaching in continuing education demands the rejection of some of the dichotomies which we in the academic world inherit. I am referring to such dichotomies as teacher-learner; "sick-well"; educated-uneducated; leader-follower.

---

[2] Dr. Harold W. Stoke, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Washington.

These dichotomies are at least partly inappropriate for adolescents and almost entirely inappropriate for adults. These dichotomies do not admit that learners are sometimes teachers, that teachers should never cease to be learners, that a person can be educated in some ways and not in others, that there are not leaders or followers because every man is something of both.

What I am arguing here for is no more and no less than that continuing education be for all of us. In the academic world, it seems to me that our continuing education can and must be at least in two directions: we must continue to grow deeply in the area of our own subject matter competence and, like the adults we hope to serve, we should constantly open new and major vistas of experience for ourselves. If we do these things, I believe we can avoid a charge recently made by a book reviewer in the New York Times, who said, "This is the age of the fool; the Charlatan is crowned King, while the scholar watches for mice in the cellar."

There is one other thing which I believe excellence demands of the adult teacher, as well as the adult learner. This is the discipline to undertake new experiences that are difficult. We know from our experimental project at Brooklyn College that although many adults have a strong urge to improve themselves, they are at first often baffled and discouraged by the discipline which systematic study imposes. One way, it seems to me, to overcome this problem in continuing education is to avoid making the difficult synonymous with the unpleasant. It is for this reason that we at the Center are currently placing a great deal of emphasis on the total physical and psychological conditions which surround the adult learning experience. Our adult students, no less than we, like to be neither threatened nor physically uncomfortable. I believe we in continuing education have not paid sufficient attention to these physical and psychological conditions that affect our programs.

Nevertheless, if our programs of continuing education are to be worthy of the best in the traditions of the university, we would do well to heed the words of the Greek poet, Hesiod, who said:

> "Before the gates of excellence, the high gods have placed sweat. Long is the road thereto, and rough and steep at the first. But when the height is achieved, then there is ease, though grievously hard in the winning."

ADULT EDUCATION, LODESTAR OF DEMOCRACY?

As I understand it, this talk should stimulate the discussions which are to follow it. The topic assigned suggests that one way to achieve this stimulation is to try to build up morale sermonizing on what a noble cause adult educators are working for. Much as I should like to try to make all of us feel good, I find it impossible to confine myself to bolstering our egos. Instead, it may be more helpful to challenge the general notion that adult education is doing a lot of good in our democracy. Hence, I set for myself the task of making a somewhat provocative statement in the hope that it will stimulate discussion.

Is adult education the lodestar of democracy? I am afraid that the frank answer is that it isn't. In defense of this negative answer, I should like to make three points: First, a number of influential thinkers believe that adult education has little relationship to and still less influence on the basic problems that our democracy is facing. As one of these persons suggested, "With the universities themselves unable to do anything about the deep sickness of our culture, it would be sheer cruelty to expect adult education to do anything."

This "deep sickness of our culture" seems to be identified with such things as our inability to understand what freedom is; a denial in the name of anti-communism of most of the values that have made this country great; and the naive belief that important community decisions are based on reason whereas in reality they are based on power and service to partisan ends. It seems to me that we must be better able than we are to answer these criticisms if we are to acclaim with any confidence that adult education is the lodestar of democracy.

A recent book, Community Power Structure,[1] provides ammunition for the critics who view adult education as being largely ineffective. Hunter studied a large American community and in a persuasive way points out that the real decision-makers of an American community are a relatively small group who form an interlocking power structure.

---

[1] Floyd Hunter. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill. The University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

Dr. Harry Miller, of our staff, in a review of Hunter's book,[2] cites the serious implications which Hunter's thesis has for adult education, and refers to Paul Sheats' Presidential Address at the 1953 Adult Education Association Conference in which Sheats remarked, "Let's face it, friends, we are a 'do-good' movement." Miller points out that since many adult educators see their major task as the solution of American community problems by means of democratizing the process of seeking solutions by group decision, a very real question must be asked: are adult educators allowed to fiddle around with relatively unimportant matters while the important decisions are carefully kept beyond their control?

In his book, Hunter develops a concept called "diversionary activity." This is activity which Hunter believes the power group permits to exist so that the energy and talents of the ever-present civic improver and dogooder are drained off into relatively harmless channels. Speaking of the city he studied Hunter states:

> When many of the associational leaders became interested in slum clearance a few years ago, there was a slight division between the top leaders as to the worthwhileness of an aggressive program of housing reform. The compromise arrived at by the leaders finally revolved around aiding a woman's group which had as its platform, "Paint up and clean up the undesirable neighborhoods." This program had all the support of the press and a great deal of organizing activity went into the explanation and promotion of the program. Paint and brooms were not the answer. Bulldozers were indicated. And the ladies who were strong for the cleaning methods finally became discouraged. The slum dwellers showed little interest in co-operating, and the owners of the properties, when they could be located, showed the same lethargy. The publicity died out, and the ladies were off on another project which had to do with helping the girls who got into the city stockade on morals charges.

Recently I spent a day observing a community development project of the University of Washington.[3] The community was Etonville, which lies at the foot of Mt. Ranier. The villagers named the project "Operation Bootstrap." More than half of the adults in the community were organized into study groups whose reports were searchingly discussed in small "buzz groups" at a weekly meeting in the local high school. To me it was a rich experience to see this community at work on its own problems. Playgrounds and schools had been improved in less than a year; village ordinances had been originated and passed, including one to require cats to wear little bells on their necks! I am not being cynical. These community actions, from the trivial to the important, seem all to the good. But a tragic note permeated the project.

---

[2] To be published in Adult Education.

[3] For a description of this interesting philosophy and program of adult education, see Democracy Is You, by Richard Poston. New York. Harpers, 1952.

Midway in this exciting community program of adult education and adult action, about 60 per cent of the male population were thrown out of work because the village's basic industry—a lumber mill—was closed down. The mill's owner did not live in Etonville; he could not be persuaded even to consider the social consequence of his absentee decision. The point of this illustration is that the community's basic problem seems to lie outside of the community's ability to do anything about. With one of the finest adult education programs I have ever seen, this community is lying flat on its economic back.

In Hunter's Regional City a city-wide adult education effort merely diverted attention to paint brushes and brooms, when in all probability the need was for bulldozers and housing programs. In the Etonville illustration the citizenry, however organized for action they are, are at the mercy of life and death forces that are beyond their control. Thus too, waves of opinion and action sweep over all of us. We are staggered into a kind of helplessness when we look at the complexities of our national budget; we are numbed by the new, slick look which the Robert Montgomeries give to our President and the crucial issues in our national policies; we are awed by the incredible photos of the hydrogen bomb. As an adult educator, I feel like I am administering aspirin to a patient with symptoms of cancer. It is in this context that I would feel silly in asserting that adult education is the lodestar of democracy.

My second point is that to claim that adult education is the lodestar of democracy is to suggest something inherently good in the term adult education itself or in adult education per se. This is obviously not true.

I think most of you would agree that it makes a great deal of difference what kind of education activity is being undertaken. We have seen, for example, strong adult education programs in societies and nations that were strikingly undemocratic. I need not bore you with details as to how the Germans put a highly organized adult education system to work to promote fascist ends. In fact, whenever we find a strong program of adult education, we ought first to inquire about the ends which it is designed to serve. As it is, adult educators, like most other people, admire success and strength. Thus, we almost automatically call "good" any adult education program or system that appears quantitatively strong. In short, I suggest the uncomfortable thought that in most cases where an adult education program is strong, partisan ends are being served. It seems to me that if this be true, we have then not adult education but either training or propaganda.

Merely by observation it seems true that adult education programs are strongest in those groups that are organized to do something—farm groups, labor groups, trade associations, the foundations that fight polio and cancer, etc. But adult education programs are usually weak in those groups that are not organized to do anything—study groups, Great Books Groups, and those groups of individuals loosely held together by vague and complex motivations. This is what makes so difficult the task of liberal adult education: that is, it seems a contradiction to expect to organize the liberal arts in such a way as to achieve specified, partisan ends.

But then we have the problem of whose definition of democracy to accept. It seems to me that one can make a good case by stating that inherent in democracy is the notion that there shall always be many definitions of it.

In asserting why adult education is not a guiding star for democracy, I have suggested two reasons: first, that a lodestar has no meaning except in terms of some more ultimate points of reference; and second, the nature of democracy makes it difficult to achieve any substantial consensus about what the ultimate points of reference should be. Thus, we are brought face to face with the important question: as adult educators, what should we try to do?

Should we seriously try to make adult education the lodestar of democracy? I don't think so. In my democracy I want many lodestars. I want opportunity to choose among lodestars. I want no one to tell me what stellar point I must steer by. A given star might force me on a course I did not wish to pursue. Perhaps a given star would not even be on my horizon, leaving me only miracle, mystery and authority. I want freedom to change my course and to change the stars I steer by, for they—chosen by me or for me at a time of limited experience and in relative ignorance—may be false guides. I want to change my lodestars as my experience expands; I want to alter my course as my intelligence grows. Maybe, at any given time, the course I ought to take is one for which at that time no lodestars even exist. Maybe as adult educators today we have no conception of the guiding notions that might ultimately point us to needs we do not now even see.

I would like now to come down from the stars and talk about the purposes of adult education in Illinois. When talking about purposes I like to make a distinction that is subtle and difficult to communicate. But a failure to make this distinction is in some sense a failure to understand the nature of a democratic society.

It seems important to distinguish between efforts to state purposes, and efforts to work at the problem of purposes. Here again, at the risk of being redundant, the lodestar analogy may be useful. To say that adult education is to be something to steer by makes no sense without consensus about where we want to go. It would be like a man vigorously charging into a taxicab and saying to the driver: "Take me Somewhere!"

If we were committed to a Marxist society, a fascist society, an ecclesiastical society, or even a democratic society according to someone's defined brand of democracy—then we could lay down a set of purposes and adult educators would know what they ought to do.

But, adult education, being itself a heterogeneous abstraction, cannot lay down a set of purposes. Adult educators, like the society of which they are a part, are a group of Jesuits, Methodists, CIO men, librarians, industrial spokesmen, and so on. And to complicate matters even further, we are never only a member of any one of these groups.

Therefore, it seems to me that in a democratic society we can never have a set of purposes; we can only have the on-going problem of purposes. As a movement then, adult education must assume as its basis a continuing pattern of changing conflicts and controversies. Far from abhoring this condition, this is the kind of condition with which I want to work. Furthermore, I believe that a movement that recognizes conflict and controversy as its basis is a movement of intellectual excitement and potential growth.

I hope this will not sound to you like a kind of organizational anarchy. It is not anarchy because it does not free us as individual adult educators from the obligation to believe in something, to have our own lodestars, to advocate what we believe in.

I can only offer what I think we as adult educators should try to do, but as E. B. White might say, this is only "one man's meat."

For me, the purposes of adult education must be derived from three sources. These sources make different, and sometimes conflicting, demands. I shall simply state these three sources and then briefly identify the principal demands which at this time seem to derive from each source. The three sources are our cultural tradition—the best that man has thought and said and done; the needs of a society that is politically organized as a democracy; and the psycho-social needs of adults in this kind of society.

From many sources in our cultural tradition, mostly from history and literature, I derive three stars to steer by, three values to guide my actions:

1. Freedom as a value;
2. Reason as a value; and
3. Continuing opportunity for individual growth as a value.

In stating what seems to me at this time to be the basic need of our democratic society, I am much indebted to a provocative statement recently made by C. Wright Mills of Columbia University.[4] In simplest terms, Mills sees our basic problem as the need to arrest current trends toward a mass society. He sees four criteria by which we can appraise the extent to which we have moved from a society of autonomous publics toward a mass society. His value assumption is that a society of autonomous publics is better than a mass society.

The four criteria are:

1. We have a mass society in the extent to which the receivers of

---

[4] See "Mass Society and Liberal Education," a paper read on April 3, 1954 in New Orleans at a National Conference on "Methods for the Study of the Urban Community." Notes and Essays, No. 9, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1954.

opinion out-number the givers of opinion. Hence, in a society of autonomous publics there is an ideal ratio of one giver of opinion to every one receiver of opinion. This is a society of an equality of give and take. By contrast, the extreme mass society is one in which one man or one group, sitting at a microphone or by a switch, would control all opinion.

2. We have a mass society in the extent to which we have an organization of communication which permits the receivers of opinion no opportunity for answering back. I believe the meaning and implications of this are clear and need no elaboration.

3. We have a mass society in the extent to which those who have opinions have no opportunity to make their opinions effective. That is, a society in which the opinions of individuals have no opportunity to be acted out.

4. We have a mass society in the extent to which institutionalized values can infiltrate the public. An extreme example of this would be a Nazi Block Organization which would permit a party line Gestapo to infiltrate every aspect of an individual's personal and social life.

Mills believes that at this point in our history, we have a situation mid-way between a society of autonomous publics and a mass society. Granting a good bit of truth to Mills' analysis, the purpose, then, of adult education in our time is to prevent by every means at our disposal the movement toward a mass society.

Finally, what then should be our purposes in terms of adult education for individuals? Here again, Mills' suggestions seem to make sense in terms of my present commitment to liberal adult education. There are three specific tasks:

1. To help the individual from being overwhelmed. Whether the individual we deal with is a member of a trade union, the NAM, or the Bar Association, it is our job to fight the forces which deny his autonomy as a human being, the forces which would make him a mass slave to an institutionalized system of rewards and punishments. Furthermore, I believe that no institutionalized system, however strong, can itself long endure if it neutralizes or defeats the maverick, the spirit of the dreamer, the spirit of the deviationist that exist to some extent in every individual.

2. A second task is to build adult education programs which can

create the conditions which permit individual anxieties and concerns to be translated into social issues that can be subjected to rational inquiry.

If a doctor has personal concerns which cannot be articulated because they lead to a stand against the AMA "line" on compulsory health insurance, if a steel-worker is denied the chance to oppose the Big Union policy on a specific law, then we have moved toward the mass society. I want to be clear: this task does not mean that our schools, libraries, museums, and colleges must either formulate social issues or take a stand on them. It does mean that such agencies of adult education must be the hallowed ground on which individuals can discover what they really believe in, and why.

3. Our third task as adult educators is to create new autonomous publics. To me, this concept of Mills is of great importance. Let me give one brief example of what is meant. A number of years ago, dissatisfied with the quality of music that was being broadcast, William Paley, President of the Columbia Broadcasting System, decided to put the New York Philharmonic on the air each Sunday afternoon. Speaking from the context of a jazz age, Paley's executive associates argued that there was no public for such a program. Paley's answer should be a classic for all adult educators. He said: "We'll create a public." And to the confounding of his associates, he did.

To us as adult educators I would say that in our own modest way we must go and do likewise—not that ours is necessarily to be a "music public" or an "anti-McCarthyism public," but a "new public" which in its own way can be a liberating one. Above all, it seems to me that adult education must be many kinds of liberating forces. I cannot, however, escape a gnawing feeling that if this were its essence, then many of the most powerful organizations which now promote and support adult education would suddenly find it too hot to handle.

GENERAL EDUCATION AND SPECIALIZED EDUCATION

It is assumed that we are all broadly familiar with the nature of the general education movement. It was a reaction against some things; and it was a movement for some things.

General education was a reaction against the great multiplication of specialized knowledge; it was for the achievement of greater unity in the learning experience.

It was against the traditional organization of subject matter into more or less isolated academic disciplines; it was for the interdisciplinary organization of subject matter.

It was against the notion of an especially educated elite; it was for a common educational experience for all.

It was against learning as merely reading, thinking and reflecting; it was for learning as an application of thinking to personal and social problem solving.

It was against college curriculum merely as preparation for graduate study; it was for a curriculum that could be both terminal and preparatory.

It was against liberal arts courses taught so as to seem irrelevant to human living in our time; it was for the reconstruction of courses that would relate twentieth century problems to the age-old problems of man, society and the search for truth.

It was against the sharp separation of general education and vocational education; it was for an integration of both.

There were of course great differences within a movement that embraced such widely differing institutions as St. John's College and the College of General Education at Minnesota. But let me gloss over these interesting and important differences because they are superseded by the point I want to make here.

As the general education movement developed, there emerged two notions about the relationship between "general" and "specialized" education. One notion is that general education should come *before* specialized education. Almost any of Mr. Hutchins' earlier writings will persuasively assert this position,[1] and until it was recently changed, the College of the University of Chicago was perhaps the best example of a college curriculum that refused to tolerate in the undergraduate years any specialization whatsoever.[2] Thus, the *first* responsibility of a college was to make the adolescent student a responsible human being. Only *after* that was done, would the adolescent acquire the specialized arts and skills necessary for him to make a living. In short, general education should come *before* specialized education.

The other notion was that general education should occur *during* specialized education. The two kinds should occur simultaneously. This notion underlay the influential Harvard Report, which stated:

> "Our conclusion, then, is that the aim of education should be to prepare an individual to become an expert both in some *particular* vocation or art *and* in the *general* art of the free man and the citizen. Thus, the two kinds of education once given separately to different social classes must be given *together* to all alike."[3]

This notion was more popular with educators than the more extreme Chicago position because high school people liked it better, for it did not invade the four years traditionally alloted to them; a college faculty member did not necessarily have to give up his precious specialized course in Wordsworth, that is, there was less radical curriculum change; and the graduate and professional schools liked it even better. In fact, some of these schools actually joined the movement to provide both general and specialized education in the same curriculum. Thus, we have seen a number of distinguished technical schools both "liberalize" their own technical curricula and work out with liberal arts colleges programs which could yield both the B. A. *and* the technical degree almost simultaneously.[4] The idea of *combining* general and specialized education received powerful support from some professional societies, notably engineering, law, and medicine, and from industrial corporations, and probably dominates the general education movement today.

---

[1] "Under an intelligible program of general education, the student would come to the end of the *sophomore year* (underlining added) with a solid knowledge of the foundations of the intellectual disciplines." Robert M. Hutchins. *The Higher Learning in America*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1936, I. 91.

[2] An interesting chronicle of how Chicago squeezed out "the last two electives" can be found in Reuben Frodin's "Very Simple, but Thoroughgoing," Ch. 2, pp. 25-99, in *The Idea and Practice of General Education*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1950.

[3] *General Education in a Free Society*. Cambridge. Harvard University Press, 1945, p. 54. (The italics are mine.)

All of this is no doubt familiar to you. I come now to the thesis of this paper—a new notion of the relationship between general education and specialized education. It can be stated this way: *general education should come neither before nor during specialized education: general education should come after specialized education.*

This, of course, may not be a new notion at all, but so far as I know, no one has asserted it quite this way. It is certain to be a provocative notion once its assumptions and implications are understood. Before briefly listing these assumptions and implications, it may be helpful to make clear what is meant here by "specialized education" and "general education." In the context of this paper "specialized education" means two things: (a) the skills and tools of literacy; and (b) the skills and tools for making a living. This definition is a middle position between those who would define specialized education too narrowly and those who would define it too broadly.

A too narrow definition would hold that specialized education *is* vocational education. A too broad definition holds that a specialized education can also result in a liberal or general education, *if* vocational subjects are taught in a liberal way. No doubt this *can* happen. But since it usually does not happen, and since there is for most vocations and professions too much to learn in too little time, it would seem unfair to impose upon specialized education the additional responsibility of providing a general education.

In arriving at a workable definition of specialized education, it seems sensible to ask: what are the minimally essential characteristics especially needed for a person to get along in our kind of society—a society which is largely democratic, industrial and dominated by an urban culture? In more primitive societies a "specialized" education might be memorizing tribal ritual, appropriate incantation to gods, etc. But in our kind of society it seems logical to expect everyone at least to be able to communicate words and ideas, and to possess the means of making a living. This, then, is what is meant here by specialized education.

---

[4] Institutions such as Case, Illinois Institute of Technology, and M. I. T. were leaders in developing such programs.

For a workable definition of general education I borrow heavily from three remarkable essays by Robert Redfield.[5] Mr. Redfield sees "the educational experience" as three related processes: exploration; conversation; and creation. With Whitehead, he sees education as a kind of cyclical "movement."

"I see a movement of the mind that begins as a free reaching outward, impelled by curiosity, wonder, excitement." This is exploration.

"I see the mind next pass through a sort of contest, a conversation of alternatives or between this event and that idea, in difficult and fruitful interaction." This is conversation.

"And then, if education happens, there is a third phase of the cycle in which the new fact or idea or experience is made a part of me; I act, internally, with regard to it." This is creation.[6]

Now without the skills of literacy and the tools for making a living, a person in our society ordinarily finds that his growth as a person and as a citizen is arrested or blocked. Hence, specialized education can rightly be regarded as an early phase of exploration, in the sense that it gives him the means to explore further. And if by chance or design vocational and literacy training opens new wonders and worlds of intellectual excitement, so much the better. If that happens then specialized education has already penetrated well into the process of exploration. But specialized education cannot be the whole of exploration.

It is general education that can and must introduce the learner to the experience of exploring the great substantive areas of human experience —the arts, the sciences and the humanities. But general education must systematically undertake at least one further step: an introduction of the individual to the process of conversation.

---

[5] The Educational Experience, published by the Fund for Adult Education, Pasadena, Calif., 1955.

[6] Ibid., p. 14.

By conversation Mr. Redfield seems to be talking about intellectual skill and a certain amount of intellectual discipline. He seems to mean such things as: the direct confrontation of the arts and sciences in their noblest formulations; the difficult discipline of understanding; the sharpening of the intellect by an on-going debate with facts and events; the unspoken dialectic of values that every man must wrestle with internally; the focused study of other societies and other value systems; a depth penetration of the world of aesthetics; the cultivation of discriminating judgment; the fairness and generosity of debate; the dialogue of experimental truth; the use of reason.

If there is a valid distinction between "general" education and "liberal" education, I would conceive of it as a vague line between an early phase of conversation and a more intense depth penetration of the process of conversation. And if liberal education can be defined as a noun, I would regard it as synonymous with creation—or the final flowering of exploration and conversation. I take creation to mean such things as: the process of making experience "our own;" and the process of giving new dimensions to experiences by transforming them, however modestly, into something reconstructed and new. Creation is almost as difficult to describe as it is to achieve. Trying to make it clear, the physical analogy of eating comes to mind. For as the body takes food internally and transforms it into energy and individual achievement, so we may take internally the experiences of emotion and reason and transform these also into energy and individual achievement.

To recapitulate: general education is defined here as bearing the major responsibility for exploration and a responsibility for at least introducing the individual to the process of conversation. And we would hope that naturally and eventually, the generally educated man would become the liberally educated man.

I return now to the assumptions and implications of the thesis that general education should come neither before nor during specialized education, but after it.

Implicit in this thesis are several assumptions about human beings: that they have a continuing urge for self-growth, a constant striving linked to long range goals; that an educated person is not so much who is something (like a Ph.D. holder), but rather one who is in a process of becoming something, one who is constantly at work on his own enlargement; that the surest way for an individual to lose his education is for him to pretend that he wholly possesses it.[7] Thus, the argument for providing general education later in life than we now expect it to occur bets heavily on the availability of the human material and the human motivation for general education. In short, it bets that most adults, whatever their present life circumstances, possess a deep and continuing desire to become freer and more adequate human beings.

The thesis also assumes certain things about the nature of our society. It assumes that the pressures on adolescents are so great that young people are not willing fully to explore their cultural heritage before they are prepared to earn a living; and it assumes that if we are to demand that every man be something of a specialist, and if specialized knowledge and skill are to continue to become more and more specialized, then in the early years there is really not adequate time for general education. To put it crudely, I do not want my surgeon to be a man of great knowledge of Aristotle but to have only a general notion of where my appendix is. This should not, however, blur the desirability of having the surgeon become a generally educated man after he has already become a competent specialist.

Finally, the thesis of this paper assumes that the great substantive areas of human experience can be more meaningful for persons after they have experienced life more fully. This assumption is effectively spelled out in the "Introduction" to the 1955 Bulletin of the New School for Social Research:

> "The process of learning . . . exposes the young to knowledge before they can explore it for themselves, to abstractions before they can experience reality, to history before they can be aware of the present, and to passive acceptance in wide areas where they cannot yet become active.
>
> "Adult education has an opportunity to reverse this sequence. The adult student, in his capacity as parent, professional, voter and

---

[7] That these assumptions are probably defensible is apparent from the evidence and inferences cited by the distinguished personality theorist, Gordon W. Allport. See his Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1955.

> taxpayer, is concerned with the present because he knows it. With part of his life already consciously spent he is also interested in the past because he is connected with it in his own experience. He is eager to test and to apply knowledge to his many practical tasks. He is aware of the complexities of life because, unlike the young college student, he is not protected by the somewhat artificial arrangements of the campus or the classroom."

Let us spell out concretely the more important implications of the thesis that general education should come after specialized education.

1. We would go all out to have individuals complete their specialized training as early in life as is possible. If necessary, all the time would be devoted to specialized training. Hence, education could begin where schooling leaves off. To "school" someone means essentially to "train" him; but to "educate" means to "lead forth," to explore, to learn in the sense of broadly comprehending. Here we come upon, I think, the great indictment of our American higher education. It is mostly "schooling," only partly "education." For we need only to remind ourselves that most undergraduates look upon the B.A. degree as a "meal ticket"; and that even a Ph.D. candidate in philosophy or literature looks upon the higher degrees as specialized vocational training, though he may erroneously think of himself as liberally educated because he is a student of a liberal art! It is little wonder then that some of our liberal arts faculty are not liberally educated, indeed not even generally educated men. And it is little surprise that Robert Frost could tell this year's graduating class at Dartmouth that as a freshman he "ran away because I was more interested in education than anybody in the College. . . ."[8] In short, although our thesis would seem to demand a radical reconversion of our higher educational system, it would in fact merely be legitimizing a change that has been in effect for a long time.

2. The other important implication is that general education would become the exciting new domain and the great new responsibility of university adult education. Adult education would shed its step-child status and become in its own right the division that takes up education where schooling leaves off, the vehicle for providing the education that young people have neither the full capacity or the adequate time for. What a revolution this would require in the assignment of our facilities, our fac-

---

[8] Dartmouth Alumni Magazine (July, 1955), p. 14.

ulties and our funds!

A society that would have at least a third of its adults systematically engaged in general education may sound Utopian. But occasionally it does no harm to dream. A recent nation-wide attitude study clearly showed that the better educated people tend better to understand and tolerate the meaning and implications of those basic civil rights upon which our democracy is based.[9] It would seem therefore that above all else, the future of our way of life depends upon a generally educated adult citizenry.

For adults who still need specialized training either at the undergraduate or graduate levels, i.e., those who see in education a way to a better job, let them come to our colleges for the traditional credit sequences. Let them complete their schooling. But for those adults who are reasonably literate and who already reasonably well established in a job, our colleges must think in terms of new and bold general education programs that are not merely "extensions" of schooling. Quite specifically, I (and most of my colleagues) have become convinced that we need "explicitly for adults" new, experimental programs leading both to a Bachelor of Arts in general education and a Master of Arts in general education.

Because of financial support from our Center there is now an experimental model for such a B.A. program. It is at Brooklyn College, and I urgently commend it to your attention.[10] The Brooklyn Project rejects the notion that a B.A. degree should be the reward for "serving time" through 124 more or less unrelated semester hours; it seeks some equation between life experience and academic credit; and it provides opportunities for guidance and independent study to supplement course work as an adult strives to achieve the Brooklyn College faculty's definition of a generally educated person.

We are now negotiating to establish in another college an experimental master of arts degree based on the same idea. We see this as important especially for those who have already earned bachelors' degrees in specialized fields. Hence, this new M.A. would not be a further specialization but an M.A. in general education, a degree that assumes that the phase of specialized "schooling" has been completed.

---

[9] Samuel A. Stouffer. Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. New York. Doubleday and Company, 1955.

[10] See a first report on this Project, by Bernard Stern. How Much Does Adult Experience Count? a pamphlet published in 1955 by The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

The thesis of this paper is no doubt provocative. Its ramifications are many and widespread. If it has seemed somewhat irreverent and impudent it is because I assume that we too, as educators, must be constantly at work on the enlargement of our responsibilities and our thinking.

ADULT EDUCATION'S "THIRD FORCE:"
THE CONCEPT OF META-CREDIT

A few years back, in world politics we witnessed the emergence of something called "The Third Force." Certain nations tried to develop an influence that stood apart from the two forces represented by American capitalism and Soviet Communism. This "Third Force" was only partly against certain things; it tried to stand for something.

I have often thought that NYU's Division of General Education stands on the verge of creating a "Third Force" in university adult education. This "Third Force" would stand apart from two powerful forces: on the one hand are those academic credit purists who, in Paul McGhee's words, "are fearful that something deplorable is likely to happen to the 'standards' of an institution if the 'Ode to a Grecian Urn' is read after six o'clock to students who have remunerative employment, and who already have, or do not choose to seek, a university degree."[1] On the other hand are those of the "Give-'em-Whatever-They-Want" School. In the extreme, these are the "fly-tyers" and "basket-weavers" who offer sequences in "Social Dancing" in defiance of academics who would at least feel better if these courses were labeled "Physical Education."

Today, as an outside observer, I should like to make a few remarks about this Division's place in the university adult education picture. Two assumptions underlie these remarks. One is that this faculty, however it may realize it, is party to one of higher education's most significant frontiers: education for adults. This has been called "the fourth level of learning"—the level that overlays elementary, secondary, and college education. From our direct contact with some 150 of this nation's leading colleges and universities, and from the statistical evidence and estimates at hand, one is able with some confidence to make a rather startling assertion:

---

[1] Paul A. McGhee, Twenty Years of University Adult Education: A Report of the Division of General Education, New York University (1934-1954), p. 3.

education for young undergraduates is no longer the main business of America's larger universities; their main business is some form of education for adults. In support of this assertion we may begin with the fact that in the majority of urban and state universities, the number of adults enrolled exceeds the combined enrollments in all of the undergraduate day divisions! Add to our statistics the adults who comprise the graduate and professional schools, and it is not difficult to defend the assertion that educating young undergraduates is no longer the major responsibility of the American university system. In a somewhat different way, Norman Cousins recently made the same assertion:

> "The conclusion is inescapable that it is no longer accurate—nor has it been for some time—to apply the term 'higher education' to American colleges. What seemed adequate only a short time ago for the purposes of top-level education now fulfils an intermediate function at best . . . the average college graduate of 1955 may be no better equipped than the average high school or even elementary-school graduate at the turn of the century. This fast-widening gap between formal education and the requirements of a world community is perhaps the main problem and challenge in education of our time."

It is because college education is "intermediate" education that we can say that today "higher" education is in fact becoming synonymous with adult education. If this assertion is valid, and if the progressively increasing enrollment bulge continues to spawn more junior colleges, more community colleges, more four-year branches of state universities, it is not inconceivable that by the turn of the next century the American university may be freed from most of its obligation to provide intermediate and preparatory education. In short, we may be approaching the time when in fact the American university may be almost solely an educational institution for adults.

My second assumption is, I believe, more immediately important than the first. You are not only a party to one of higher education's most significant frontiers, but what you are doing in university adult education is distinctive. If, indeed, you are a "third force," you are on the outpost of the frontier. Like any frontier, it is not easy to describe what you symbolize. It is the purpose of this paper to attempt to begin to describe it.

We estimate that about 85 per cent of all university adult education is credit work—largely the uncritical importation of undergraduate, credit courses into the evening and extension divisions. I have frequently called this "night school" education. No doubt the "night school" will continue as an important institution in a society that commendably values college-level opportunities for individuals who must use the daylight hours in order to earn a living. But I hardly need add that this Division is not a "night school" offering traditional credit courses for adults.

University adult educators most frequently cite you as the great champion of non-credit adult education, the kind now making up about 15 per cent of all university adult education. But it is the burden of this paper to suggest that this is at best a superficial view of your distinctive role.

Paul McGhee's writings have been richly provocative; in adult education generally, his influence is pervasive; yet—what McGhee writes and what you do here are not fully understood. You seem least understood by the people who agree with you. I repeat that your admirers believe that you carry the torch for non-credit adult education. This is accurate as far as it goes, but it fails to do you justice. I believe that you are on the verge of something more important than the idea of non-credit: it is a concept which I should like to call meta-credit.

By this term I obviously mean something different from credit in the usual sense; and I mean something different from non-credit in its literally negative sense. By meta-credit I mean to refer to educational activity for which the older terms "credit" and "non-credit" lose their meaning; they become irrelevant. Meta-credit literally means "beyond" or "above" credit. Let me illustrate: when the Bell Telephone executives attend the Institute for Humanistic studies at Pennsylvania, no academic credits are involved. Yet this is not a non-credit program as we usually think of it. When George Kennan was given a fellowship at Princeton's Institute for Advanced Studies, no doubt he would have viewed as silly and irrelevant any suggestion that his studies there were either for credit or for non-credit.

I doubt if these academic terms would make any sense to the men who attend the NYU Tax Institute, or your Seminar on Retirement Planning, or your program on Advertising Agency Management. And yet, even apart from the vocational or professional quid pro quo involved in these three programs, there is a kind of "credit" conferred on these adults simply because they have "come to the university." More specifically, it means something to attend the Tax Institute or to be a Fellow at the Princeton Institute. There is a kind of public recognition of the prestige involved.

Another interesting aspect of the meta-credit concept is that the men who come to such programs probably do not see themselves as "adult students." Instead, they probably see themselves as something like participants in a high level learning activity befitting their status and experience. Their privileges of using your Faculty Club is an ingenious and effective recognition of this, a far cry from taking lecture notes in classrooms that smell of chalk and the institutional aroma of floor-sweeping compound that gets stuck around the base of bolted-down desks. One might even assert that meta-credit programs have a feeling and a smell of their own. In the absence of being able to give you a concise definition of meta-credit, I am trying to suggest a feeling for the image of it.

I have said that NYU stands on the verge of developing a "third force" in university adult education. I have suggested that the concept of meta-credit provide the substance for this "third force." I turn now to suggest several principles as possible building blocks for this "third force" concept:[2]

1. New relationships between specialized and general education should be established.

For two decades now we have witnessed sustained attempts to pump general education into somewhat reluctant youth who have only a limited readiness for it and an incomplete maturity to profit from it. We have also seen attempts to label specialization as a kind of disease peculiar to our culture. The results have been that general education is often viewed as a panacea for all the ills of our civilization, when in fact it is no such thing; that young people with B.A. degrees are believed to be generally educated, when in fact they are only partially educated; and that specialized and general education are somehow separable and antithetical, when in fact they are overlapping and complementary. [Note that I do not say that general and specialized education are the same thing. I do say that they overlap and complement each other.]

I believe that one reason why the NYU program has not fully developed the "Third Force" concept is that you are superficially viewed as a vast conglomeration of non-credit courses, and because these are erroneously regarded as synonymous with specialized education. I do not think your program is synonymous with specialization. It is really a commendable blending and blurring of the traditional distinction between specialized and general education. I would elevate this blending and blurring to the status of a "third force" principle in which high-level specialized courses for adults are strongly affirmed as a function of the university; in which specialized programs in every way possible are systematically planned to contribute to the general education of adults; and in which general education is viewed, not as something to come exclusively before and during specialization but after it as well.[3] In short, the notion of meta-credit suggests something beyond and above that which we usually think of as a generally educated person; it suggests an overlay, a suprabracket for the usual distinction between special and general, vocational and cultural.

---

[2] I offer these several principles merely as a springboard for further discussion of the "Third Force" idea.

2. New forms of academic recognition are needed.

In the traditional credit system, the standard form of academic recognition is the bachelor's degree, sometimes referred to as a "meal ticket." Frequently this is but a money-changers' deal in which separate course credits are bartered for the students' time. Or, as one writer put it, the B.A. degree is won in the way Tom Sawyer collected his Sunday School tickets: ten white tickets were exchanged for one red one; five red ones for one yellow one; three yellow ones for one blue one. The blue one, like the sheepskin, was the pay-off.[4]

In most non-credit work there is no provision for academic recognition at all; in some, under prescribed conditions, adults can earn "certificates" and "associate" or "adjunct" degrees. But these are not generally considered as legal tender. They are viewed as a kind of Confederate money.

I believe that the "third force" concept needs at least three new forms of academic recognition:

---

[3] Cf. my article, "General Education and Specialized Education: A New Notion about Their Relationship," The Journal of General Education, IX, No. 1 (October, 1955), pp. 54-59.

[4] See Chapter 10, "Time Off for Good Behavior," in John Diekhoff's new book, The Domain of the Faculty, New York, Harpers, 1955.

First—Bachelors' degree requirements should be reconstructed in order to provide academic recognition for the educative effects of adult experience. Here meta-credit suggests the educative possibilities that lie in the adults' experiential world beyond the classroom. This can be achieved if degree requirements are stated, not exclusively in terms of formal study and informal life experience. Thus, in terms of B.A. degree requirements, it should not be a question of what courses the student took, but rather: has he achieved the qualities of a liberally educated person? I see no reason why universities should not encourage and recognize adults who know how to learn systematically and independently outside the classroom.[5] A business executive is not judged by the college courses he took but by the results he can achieve. Why then judge adult student performance in terms of means instead of ends?

Second—we need new forms of recognition at the masters degree level. I have come to feel that some of the more exciting challenges in education for adults lie, not in the undergraduate area, but in the graduate area at the masters level. I am not arguing for a new degree, but rather for some new forms of the traditional degree of Master of the Arts. These should be in the form of a terminal degree. They might be a professional degree, an avocational degree or a masters in general education *per se*.[6]

Third—we need some way to provide recognition and reward to the intellectually curious adults who are the independent learners. I don't think this would be any form of an academic degree. I once proposed that it be a Distinguished Cultural Award granted by the community. No proposal ever fell more flat. Nevertheless, I repeat that we need to find ways to recognize an individual's on-going cultural and intellectual growth in the same way our society rewards the acquiring of increased vocational skills.

---

[5] Cf. the Center-sponsored Brooklyn College Experimental Degree Program for Adults. Two publications are available from the Center: *How Much Does Adult Experience Count?* and *Adults Grow in Brooklyn*. Both of these are written by Bernard H. Stern.

[6] The Center has collected considerable material on a possible project for "A Master's Degree in General Education." See also Wayne A. R. Leys, "The Terminal Masters Degree" to be published in a forthcoming issue of *Harvard Educational Review*. I have also heard that Connecticut Wesleyan is experimenting with a program leading to a Master of Arts in Liberal Studies.

A second principle, then, for the "third force" concept is new forms of academic recognition beyond and above the present ones.

3. The longer-range concentration for study activity should be in terms of the individual adult.

One of the most potent and commendable cornerstones of Paul McGhee's philosophy is that you must "take 'em from where they are." This, however, leaves unasnwered two tough questions: "Where are they?" and "Where do you take 'em when you take 'em from where they are?" In its simplest form I believe the answer is that this must be worked out for each individual adult. In regular credit programs the diagnosis, direction and focus for study are determined by the degree requirements. What an adult already knows or doesn't know is assumed; what he needs to know is rather precisely prescribed. In non-credit programs we seem to get either specialization or scatteration, the latter sometimes producing a breed of perennially dependent adult students whom someone described as "chalk-smellers." In general or liberal education for adults, i.e., education that lies outside of strictly professional and technical training, I find it difficult to defend specialization and scatteration for those who want it that way.

But more desirable than either prescription or scatteration is what might be called the principle of co-operatively planned concentration. By this I mean the freedom and opportunity for each adult to work out longer-range programs of concentrated study with the help of faculty members who are competent in the relevant fields of knowledge and experience. I would only add that this freedom should include the adult student's freedom not to specialize or concentrate if he doesn't want to. I fully realize that co-operative planning for concentrated study poses difficult problems for faculty members, especially part-time ones. Yet I believe that the difficulties can be overcome if administratively we realize that teaching adults effectively is something far more than "meeting a class" over a set period of time. Effective adult learning is something of a clinical operation, and to achieve this tutorials, seminars, and guided independent self-study are perhaps more effective forms than regular classes. At least they should supplement formal classes. It may be that adult education's greatest untapped resource is the adult students' ability and desire to learn on their own. And one of the greatest wastes in adult education may be that we require the faculty to spend too much teaching time in classrooms.

In short, the principle I am here proposing is a kind of "custom-tailoring" of long-range concentrated study programs for each individual adult. In this "custom-tailoring" the faculty member would play a more key role than a professional counsellor or an administrator.

4. New notions of the teacher/learner relationship must be explored.

In the high-level forms of university adult education, learners are often teachers and teachers are often learners. In short, in adult education the line between teachers and learners is often blurred. Again to cite the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study as an example, I suspect a visitor there would be hard put to distinguish between the learners and the teachers. Thus, I am moved to propose that as a principle for our "third force" concept, instead of the teacher-learner distinction we substitute the notion of a "community of learners."

I have proposed four possible principles with which we might build a "third force" concept of adult education. In conclusion, I should like to suggest two major implications which these four principles may have for NYU's Division of General Education.

One—In order to bring this "third force" concept more fully into being, you may be obligated to undertake more systematic experimentation and research. Very briefly, I should like to suggest, merely as illustrative, the kind of experimental activity relevant to the four principles I listed.

We need more experimental programs in general education for those adults who are well educated in specialized ways. This means that universities like this must seek more ways to work effectively with business, professional, labor and government groups. It means greatly enriching the valid notion of "taking 'em from where they are," recognizing that this usually means beginning with motivations that are vocationally oriented. The great experimental challenge here is how to overlay (not replace) vocational motives with broader social and cultural concerns.

As an example of a new form of academic recognition, we need to try out, I think an experimental avocational degree at the masters level. Such a degree could meet an urgent social need—the need for training in civic leadership. Most college graduates play one or more social leadership roles as an avocation. They are the leaders in churches, voluntary organizations, parent groups, leisure and civic enterprises, discussion groups on world affairs, etc. Thus, I suggest the possibility of concentrated programs of study in such fields as "International Relations," not for scholars but for adult group discussion leaders; a master's degree in "education," not for teachers but for parents. Some of us at the Center are coming to feel that in adult education the master's degree can mean not specialization but concentration.

While I am at it, I might as well be presumptious and suggest parenthetically that under certain arrangements these avocational degrees in fields other than education could become professional degrees for public school teachers. For at least some adult students in graduate teacher education, it seems a pity to me that they go on proliferating courses in the specialized field of education instead of taking advantage of the rich general education offerings of a division like this. For example, for a social studies teacher a concentrated program in Asiatic Culture instead of six more courses in educational administration. I am suggesting the radical notion that "credit" for work in a division like this need not be of the traditional kind that Dean McGhee so understandably steers clear of. I believe that the "third force" concept requires a new experimental frame of reference for academic recognition.

As to programs that would introduce focus and direction into an elaborate non-credit program, I believe we need at least two kinds of experimental projects: (1) we need to experiment with co-operative diagnosis and prescription. That is, I would like to see attempted a systematic program in which academic specialists together with adult students would work out long-range objectives and programs of study in terms of the needs of the individual adult; and (2) we need some careful studies of the costs of such programs and of the adult students' willingness to pay those costs. Our preliminary analysis of the cost aspects of the Brooklyn program indicates that this kind of co-operative diagnosis and prescription is economically feasible for the university.

Finally, I believe that in terms of the adult teacher-student relationship we badly need some research, not on adult learning itself, but on how adults learn to learn. We are attracted to the notion that the urban environment offers especially meaningful learning opportunities if somehow we can help adults learn how to learn from their own experiences. As a particularly fruitful adult education research concept, I would propose this as the mathematical notion of "Learning to the Second Power."[7]

Thus, if I am correct in my belief that Dean McGhee and his colleagues have effectively initiated a "third force" concept in adult education, it seems to me that you are obligated to develop it further by means of research and experimentation.

I should like to suggest many other implications which this "third force" concept has for you, but I will limit myself to a second major one: this is the need to establish here at Washington Square an Adult Learning College. If I were asked to name the three or four most important specific needs in American adult education today, certainly I would name as one of them the need to establish such an Adult Learning Center.

Earlier I asserted that the "third force" concept has a feeling of its own; to realize this, the concept needs a distinctive physical home of its own. I cannot presume to suggest a blueprint for this, but I think I can suggest a few images of what such a Center would be like. The images to follow were suggested to me by some of the exciting terms used in the introduction to George Stoddard's Self-Study report. I was particularly struck by the concept of "Central City." It suggested that a great university serving "Central City" must have a kind of omnibus center for adult learning.

Such a center would be partly in the image of a "learning clinic" in which the great resources of a university would combine with the tremendous talents and opportunities of a great city to the end of providing ongoing intellectual adventure for adults; such a center would be the matrix for advanced research and experimentation in adult education; it would be a kind of city club for the socially alert and intellectually curious whether they be "teachers" or "students." In fact, the distinction would not be clear. (I would see varying degrees of "membership" or association with this club-like center.) In short, such a center would be, not a "schoolish" institution at all, but a little pocket of intellectual excitement deep in the heart of the world's greatest urban center.

---

[7] Preliminary work on this notion has been done by the Center staff in connection with its blueprint for an experimental project known as "The Laboratory College for Adults."

What I am suggesting might be called an Adult Institute for Advanced Study.

In this paper I have deliberately proposed what I hope is a provocative set of terms: "third force" . . . . "meta-credit" . . . . "concentration" . . . . "avocational masters" . . . . "co-operative diagnosis and prognosis" . . . . "learning to the second power" . . . . "learning clinic" . . . . "Adult Institute for Advanced Study." And so on.

I have done so for two reasons. First, all of us here are a part of the striking phenomenon called "adult education." As a conglomeration of so many things, adult education lacks adequate theoretical bases, and I think that such terms suggested here may help in our search for such bases. Second, it seemed to me that what has been begun here at NYU during the past twenty-five years deserves some attempt at describing its distinctiveness. In a fumbling sort of way I have tried to build a little more onto the important conceptual foundations which Paul McGhee and his colleagues have already laid. Above all, I feel that what has been done at NYU needs a new set of terms and new ways of thinking about the urban university's responsibility for educating adults.

CAN ADULT EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS AMOUNT TO MUCH?

It is difficult to understand why we organize an adult education association. In fact, it is not easy to say what an adult education association really is. It is not a professional society, representing a discrete body of knowledge. It is certainly not a trade or vocational association. It is not a group of hobby-lobbyists, nor merely a conclave of civic reformers. It is certainly something more than a fraternal organization or a convention-going social gathering. Does it exist to fight for or against any set of specific things? Hardly. Is it an organization established to provide practitioners with an opportunity to swap experiences and problems? It is only partly that. Is an adult education association a part of a significant social movement that has a sense of unity and purpose? Probably not.

And, yet, we exist as an association, which raises the question, "Who are we?" For some of us, adult education is a vocation. We are interested in adult education because that is our job. For us, perhaps adult education associations are trade associations. Then there are those of us whose pay check depends less on the success of our adult educational program than it does on our ability to use that program to achieve an end that is not educational but something else. For example, an industrial personnel man's ultimate purpose is to help his company make more money. For the industrial personnel man the adult education association is of secondary importance. He probably joins for somewhat the same reason that a shopkeeper joins a merchant's improvement association. Next are those whose breadwinning income does not depend even indirectly upon adult education. These are our friends from the voluntary agencies like the unpaid leaders of the League of Women Voters.[1]

---

[1] I have avoided the invalid labels—"professional" and "lay leaders" because: a) the field of adult education is as yet insufficiently professionalized so that any such distinction is blurred, and b) for this paper I do

Thus, one way to classify adult education association members might be in terms of how much they depend upon adult education for making a living. There are of course other ways we might classify who we are. One other way would be to classify adult education association members according to different philosophic views. For example, my philosophical commitment is to liberal adult education and some of my co-workers here may perceive this as somewhat antithetical to their philosophic commitment to vocational education, or to social reform, or to mental and emotional health.

Classification according to philosophic differences becomes sharper when we note that this association probably includes members from both the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association and the CIO, these people undoubtedly having differing economic and social philosophies. Or sharper still becomes the classification if we realize that in less hysterical times it would be quite possible for the Pennsylvania Adult Education Association to include political education workers from both the GOP and the Communist Party.

The more I think about adult education associations and about who we are, the more astonished I am that associations such as this exist at all.[2] Perhaps I can be clearer by referring to the adult education association of which I am most immediately a member.

I am at best an ineffective member of the Adult Education Council of Greater Chicago. I feel agitated and guilty because the Council means so little to me whereas I feel it should mean a great deal. I feel guiltier still because our Council leaders are competent and interesting people and I am of little help to them. But let me be harsh and assert that the Chicago Council—like most adult education associations I know—seems to be a loose federation of veto groups. By this I mean that policies and goals must be set so as not to alienate or irritate anybody's vested interest or scheme of values. Thus, after a recent self-study, the Council stated its purpose as a two-fold one: 1) to serve as a means of communication; and

---

not find such a distinction as useful as some of the broader distinctions I am trying to make.

[2] Throughout this paper, what is said in large measure also applies to local adult education councils and to the Adult Education Association, U.S. itself.

2) a catch-all service category to include "fellowship," "in-service training," "service to one another," and to be "a channel for cross-fertilization," although precisely what is to be cross-fertilized is not indicated.[3]

Before we get too pessimistic, we might observe the striking similarity between the problems of an adult education association and the problem of democracy itself. For, as at least one keen student of the American character has observed, our democracy grinds forward on a kind of a negative dynamic generated by veto groups.[4]

In terms of whether an adult education association can amount to much, it seems to me that we therefore have these three possibilities:

1. An adult education association can have a limited usefulness by serving as a problem "swap-shop" and as a secretariat for information exchange. Parenthetically, may I say that whatever else an adult education association is, it must at least be these things, i.e., in some measure serve as a secretariat, service agency, a place for "fellowship," etc.

2. It can grind along, making some progress in whatever direction and for whatever cause that will not be vetoed by any important member of the association. I have termed this a kind of "negative dynamic."

3. It can seek to generate a "positive dynamic." By "positive dynamic" I mean a sense of shared purpose and the sense of prestige and excitement that rubs off on people who feel they are associated with something of on-going, growing importance.

Regarding the first possibility, I repeat that whatever else an adult education association becomes, it must always be something of a secretariat and service agency for its members. There is no quarrel about this. The important question at least for me is whether an adult education association can amount to more than this. Regarding the second possibility, it should be noted that a "negative dynamic" is not without value.

---

[3] Self-Study Recommendations Adopted by the Board of Directors, Adult Education Council of Greater Chicago, March 12, 1955.

[4] David Riesman. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven. Yale University Press, 1950, pp. 241ff. Riesman says, "We have entered a political and social phase in which power is dispersed among "veto groups." These groups are too many and too diverse to be led by moralizing; what they want is too various to be moralized—and what is called political leadership, as we see in Roosevelt's case, consists in the tolerant ability to manipulate coalitions."

At least it prevents an adult education association from being captured and made the tool of any one special interest. This too is all to the good. But for me the central question remains: can an adult education association develop any kind of "positive dynamic?" I should like to explore a few ways in which a "positive dynamic" might be developed.

The earliest way to generate a positive dynamic is to be intensely for or intensely against something. For example, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis achieves a tremendous "positive dynamic" in its fight against polio. Hence, during the field trials they created an adult education program that was astonishingly successful, alive and vigorous. An adult education council may temporarily develop a sense of excitement and a positive dynamic by fighting for something, such as the creation of an educational TV station. Thus, too, a democratic country can develop a positive dynamic by being against a common enemy in time of war, or for something—as our country seemed to be in the early days of the "New Deal."

Thus, we see that a second fairly easy way for an adult education association to develop a "positive dynamic" is to capitalize on some sort of social crisis. For example, in Chicago my own Hyde Park neighborhood area suddenly comes "alive" with community purpose in the face of corrosive threat of slum blight and interracial strife. Our Hyde Park-Kenwood community organization therefore becomes an effective adult education association. The generalization, I believe, is this: a society in crisis can develop a "positive dynamic." I do not belittle the value of this, but I have some serious questions. Among them are: can an adult education movement sustain itself by feeding upon constant crisis situations? In any given crisis are the forces of good and evil always so clear as to command a united support on the side of the angels? Even in war some groups try to veto actions for national defence and even now many still deplore the "positive dynamic" of the "New Deal" era. Are not the deeper causes of crisis glossed over by a united but temporary unity brought about when the crises erupt? Do we not tackle results instead of causes? Are not symptoms mistaken for cures?

Let me put it this way: our adult education agencies may effectively unite to herd our children into caves when the big flash hits, but how potent can we really be in preventing an H bomb from falling upon any human being in the first place?

A third possible way for adult education associations to achieve a "positive dynamic" is to commit themselves to a more evolutionary process called "community development." The basic notion here is that all will be well if we can get local citizen groups to sit down in face-to-face contacts so that with "togetherness," "feedback," and all the rest, we slowly chip away at the obstacles to a good society.

The "community development" way of creating a "positive dynamic" needs careful and sustained consideration. There is much good in it. It is no doubt the prevailing notion in adult education today, and has enjoyed some successes. It is frequently criticized unfairly, either because the critics do not understand it, or because superficial issues are raised, like the issue between "group process" and "content."

But several deeper issues are not clearly understood. First, what is a good community, anyhow? To raise this question where it hurts will inevitably bring into play all the veto groups. When this happens, the "negative dynamic" again takes over. One group's solution turns out to be another group's problem. Second, many critics feel that the "community development" approach can generate only a low level "positive dynamic" because the role of power is ignored.[5] Thirdly, a strictly community development approach leaves out of the adult education picture, not only the power people but often the artists, the poets, the dreamers and the intellectuals. In short, when "community" is conceived in local terms, adult associations are impoverished by the absence of those who view "community" as being all mankind, or the world of art, or something of this sort. Finally, I do not see how the community development possibility can create a "positive dynamic" for adult education associations in urban areas because the usual concept of "community" is inadequate. The community development approach holds a concept of "community" that is only partly true. To those who live in large urban areas, the face-to-face, neighborhood notion of "community" does not have much meaning. Our society, by and large, is not like that anymore. A sense of shared, neighborly values is fragmented and shattered by a complexity of special

---

5. See Harry L. Miller, "Decision-Makers of an American Community," Adult Education, Vol. IV, No. 5, May, 1954.

group allegiances that overlay and permeate our older notions of gemeinschaft. We fail to see that in our society newer and bolder bases for gemeinschaft must be found. Thus, I believe that the community development approach will limp along from crisis to crisis until and unless we find more adequate concepts of what "community" means in a society that is largely secular in its values, urban and industrial in its social organization.

To summarize, I have pointed out three possible ways in which adult education associations might generate a "positive dynamic": first, they can stake out specific stands for or against specific problems; second, they might fuse together temporarily in times of social crisis; or third, they can embark more fully upon the currently popular community development approach. While all three of these possibilities may be partly or temporarily successful, it was seen that all three possibilities have serious limitations. I come then to a fourth possibility which at present seems to me ought also to be tried.

In a democratic society a good way to achieve a "positive dynamic" for adult education is through inquiry and controversy.

Adult education associations can be exciting and indispensable agencies for inquiry—inquiry about the deeper personal, cultural, social, spiritual, aesthetic and intellectual needs of the one thing we all are concerned with—the adult himself; inquiry about the deepest possible issues confronting a free society;[6] inquiry about how we can promote an understanding of our common cultural heritage.

Inquiry will lead to controversy. I happen to believe that controversy is good because it generates the kind of "positive dynamic" peculiarly appropriate to a free society. For whenever any position can be controverted, there is little danger of any closed value system taking over. One of my greatest concerns is whether adult education associations are strong enough and mature enough to face controversy.

---

[6] Such issues as: how to enhance "community interest" in the face of "special interest," how to remain free as well as secure; how to use and control power for the common good; how to diminish ignorance, prejudice and fear; how to reach greater numbers of adults with programs that develop the arts of being free men; and the problem of peace in an atomic age.

If I am correct in my analysis in this paper, an exciting program suggests itself for adult education associations—local, state and national. Briefly stated, the program is this: that during the next five years all of us in adult education initiate a "Great Debate"on the meaning and purpose of adult education. In short, we should start a gigantic inquiry in which controversy and differing positions will be welcomed and encouraged. With active co-operation of all of you, especially in the planning stages, I believe that the Adult Education Association, U.S. should undertake to sponsor this "Great Debate." What I am proposing is a nation-wide, grass roots Great Conversation, not about Aristotle and Plato, but about us, adult educators and what we are trying to achieve by means of adult education associations, what such associations really amount to and what they should amount to.

I see six important values to such a "Great Debate."

1. It would not threaten any "veto groups" because it would seek to produce no panacea, no blueprint, no universal philosophy. Rather, it would be a debate between philosophies. The discussion would be its own reward.

2. Local adult education associations would be stimulated to clarify their own aims and purposes.

3. The Adult Education Association, U.S. would be enabled to appraise its own services to members and its role as the national headquarters of a movement that is culturally and socially significant.

4. Such a "Great Debate" would enable the national AEA Conference to become an annual forum in which the results of inquiry could be shared and the nature of controversies discussed.

5. The public relations value would be enormous, for the general public would be treated to a nation-wide display of intellectual, cultural and social excitement. Thus, adult education might be seen for what it actually should be, a microcosm of democracy itself at work.

6. Finally, the highest value of all, the "veto groups" would be forced in an atmosphere of free and matured debate to keep their own special interest goals under constant examination and re-construction. All this points to what is perhaps democracy's greatest danger, namely, that we are becoming a society in which massive special interest groups seal off rational

inquiry about their own ends. If this continues to happen we shall have, not an "open society," but a series of little closed societies. We may then experience a subtle, long-range death more final than any atomic conflagration.

VOLUNTARY PLANNING: FROM CO-ORDINATION TO ACTION TO PURPOSE

I assume that one of the few questions that are of primary importance to a free society is: can effective voluntary planning be done by groups with diverse and often conflicting interests?[1]

Last year I proposed that an adult education association, like democracy itself, ordinarily grinds forward on a kind of negative dynamic.[2] Groups that come together freely and voluntarily tend to want to check each other; our democratic political systems, like our adult education associations, are made up of powerful veto groups—religious, economic, social, political, ethnic and even racial.[3] Therefore, may I note a second assumption: namely, that the difficulties in making voluntary planning work effectively are not unlike the difficulties in making democracy itself work effectively.

It is probable that as a voluntary association, your Joint Planning Commission has had an orthodox history. A time of social crisis, World War II, compelled many diverse groups to come together for the common good of the Dominion. It is one of the great things about a democracy that voluntary groups in a time of crisis can do this. The common threat defeated, the voluntary groups found that the pooling of their experiences and the exchange of information has been valuable. They decided now to organize what has been previously experienced in an unorganized way.

---

[1] I would see the other primary question as: freedom vs. security; economic planning vs. laissez faire; mass education vs. selective education; and material vs. non-material values.

[2] "Can Adult Education Associations Amount to Much?" an address at Pennsylvania State University, June 1955.

[3] Cf. David Riesman, The Lonely Crowd, Yale, 1950. ". . . in the last fifty years a change has occurred in American power configurations, from the power hierarchy of a ruling class to the power dispersal of what we shall call 'veto groups.'" (p. 235). And "These groups are too many and diverse to be led by moralizing; what they want is too various to be moralized and too intangible to be bought off for cash alone; and what is called political leadership consists, as . . . in Roosevelt's case, in the tolerant ability to manipulate coalitions." (p. 241).

I should say that the current Eisenhower phenomenon is something of a myth, systematically contrived to meet an important but ephemeral psychological need in our people. That is, this so-called "unity" under Eisenhower, if it is any kind of "unity" at all, is a passing phenomenon, not an invalidation of Riesman's argument.

They hit upon the principle of co-ordination, but even this seemed fraught with some dangers. The voluntary groups looked to their most rare and precious quality, autonomy, and they wondered if co-ordinating means coercing.[4] Appropriate assurances were given to the veto groups; and under rather exceptionally skillful and sensitive leadership they moved into what might be called "the empirical years." They undertook, although with caution, an impressive array of actions.[5] But like most other associations of voluntary agencies, they never quite faced the problem of purpose—the problem of what they really exist for. Perhaps they never will; perhaps they never should!

I come now to the thesis of this paper: THAT VOLUNTARY PLANNING CAN BE VIEWED AS A MOVEMENT FROM CO-ORDINATION TO ACTION TO PURPOSE.

On the assumption that the problems of our organization, the Center, are somewhat analogous, I propose to examine this thesis against the background of our experiences in working with a voluntary association of American universities which are engaged in adult education.[6]

First I want to distinguish between four things: the adult consumers of agency programs; the agents or agencies, such as the groups represented in the Canadian Joint Planning Commission; the voluntary association as an agency of agencies; and finally, something I should like to call a "center"-agency.[7]

---

[4] Cf. "Foreword" by John E. Robbins. The Joint Planning Commission, by Clare E. Clark. Published by the CAAE for the Fund for Adult Education. 1954.

[5] Ibid., pp. 19-29.

[6] From the beginning, the Center's clientele has been the Association of University Evening Colleges. Recently the Center has been working more and more with the National University Extension Association. These are the two most important U.S. Associations concerned with university adult education.

[7] It is interesting that you call yourself a "Commission," while

For the remainder of this paper I shall be dealing with voluntary planning as it is done by the voluntary association (the agency of agencies), such as the Joint Planning Commission and by the "center"-agency, which is a kind of headquarters for the voluntary association. In this latter case I am talking mostly about our Center (perhaps a pure type of "center"-agency), but also to some extent I am talking about the function of the central office for the Joint Planning Commission. In short, lurking behind my thesis is this question: in terms of voluntary planning, what is the proper role of the "center"-agency in working with the voluntary association?

It is now necessary to make clearer just what a "center"-agency is and does. Then I want to show how such an agency can help move voluntary planning from co-ordination to action to purpose. A matter of interest to you may be the notion that the Joint Planning Commission is already to some extent a "center"-agency. It seems to me that a policy question of importance is whether or not it is desirable for that central office to move more or less in this direction.

What, then, are the characteristics of a "center"-agency? I suggest that there are at least four:[8]

1. It has a certain independence and disinterestedness. In our case this is achieved by an almost complete support by a foundation, the Fund for Adult Education. I am not sure independence and disinterestedness can be achieved in any other way, although I am fascinated by the possibilities of a relatively new phenomenon in the United States, quasi-independent public authorities created by democratic legislative process, and financed by a combination of tax money and earned income.[9] This phenomenon may be of special interest to Canada where there appears

---

your counterpart in the U.S. calls itself a Council (Council of Nation Organizations).

[8] See "The Place of a Center-Type Agency in Liberalizing Adult Education," A Special Report from the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults (Dec. 30, 1955).

[9] Examples in the U.S. are the TVA, the N. Y. Port Authority, and at the local and state levels, highway and transit authorities. In Chicago the Park District is a good example. Senator Lister Hill also proposed such a national authority to handle funds for education had the income from tidelands oil been earmarked for education.

to be a closer and more harmonious relationship between private and public agencies, especially in education.

In our case, the Center is independent and disinterested because it is directly controlled neither by the source of its funds, nor by the regular governmental machinery of the voluntary association it serves. It is controlled by a legally incorporated independent Board. It was struck by two relevant references in Clare Clark's Report. She calls the Joint Planning Commission ". . . at once both a dependent and independent body." And by the peculiar way in which agencies can be "members" of the Commission without "joining," they remain somewhat immune to becoming mixed up in a lot of administrative machinery usually involved in running voluntary associations.[10]

2. A second characteristic of a "center"-agency is that in a relatively new field it must to some extent perform a secretariat function. This usually means at least two things: serving as a clearing house; and performing a communications function. The crucial point, however, is that a "center"-agency successfully resists being merely a "chore-boy" for the voluntary association. It does not permit its resources and energies to be absorbed by trying to honor almost any service requests made to it. It is less interested in taking on the solution of specific problems than it is in seeing that the voluntary agencies ask the more important questions.

3. The third characteristic of a "center"-agency, and the heart of the matter, is that it has three peculiar functions: it is an initiator; it is a catalyzer; and it is a broker dealing in new ideas. It is an initiator in the sense that it constantly tries to think up new things the voluntary association and its agencies ought to be doing. In the evening college movement one of the things we have tried to initiate is greater concern for purpose. That is, thought, study and action, not so much about how to solve problems, but about why American universities should be in the business of adult education. Here we see a good example of trying to move voluntary planning in the direction of consideration of purpose. In this connection it is interesting to note that while the whole tone of Clare Clark's Report is a dynamic one, Joint Planning Commission obviously

---

[10] Cf. Clare E. Clark, op. cit., pp. 15 and 16.

resists the role of initiator.[11] We tend to feel, however, that innovation is a central responsibility of a "center"-agency.

Being a catalyzer involves sensitivity to certain things that are at the moment alive within the voluntary movement. Among these things are trends, ideas, imaginative leaders, and general "areas of pain." Among the trends and ideas now alive in the evening college movement we find an awakening awareness that adult education may be something more than synonymous with going back to school at night; we find also that the imaginative leaders are not always the elected officers of the association. This means that a "center"-agency can often move voluntary planning forward more rapidly by working with individuals and individual institutions rather than through the association's administrative machinery. And finally, we find that in the evening college movement in the U.S.A. the most persistent "area of pain" is the second-class status which adult education holds within the American university. The point of all this is to show how a "center"-agency can help bring about changes by capitalizing on the forces "alive" in the association at any given time. Being an initiator and a catalytic agent, the "center"-agency inevitably becomes a kind of broker, especially dealing in the commodity of new ideas. Thus, to the foundations we can provide advice on ideas worth investing in, and to those in the voluntary associations we can provide the stimulation of ideas leading to research, innovation, and experimentation.

4. I come now to the fourth and final characteristic of a "center"-agency: it, too, has a problem of purpose. Granting that a "center"-agency exists for something beyond co-ordinating the work of voluntary groups, just what does it exist for? If it has a single ideology or philosophy to "sell," it is no longer an independent and disinterested agency; it becomes a propaganda agency for a force or forces outside the voluntary association. If this happens, the "center"-agency is doomed to failure. Yet apart from trying to help the voluntary associations to face up to their purposes, the "center"-agency has its own problem of purposes. It can be empirical, and I rather suspect that it has to be. But it cannot be aimless. It

---

[11] See Clare E. Clark, op. cit. "The Commission sees itself as primarily an advisory and planning body rather than one that sponsors and initiates program." (p. 10). And ". . . the Commission's work has been characterized more by the greater breadth and extensiveness of its services than by innovation." (p. 12).

helps to have a general purpose and the Commission does have one: to further the cause of adult education. Our purpose is slightly more specific: to further the cause of liberal education for adults.

But precisely what does this problem of purpose mean? For a "center"-agency, I think it means that purpose is not so much a thing to be defined as it is a process for on-going investigation. This gives a certain tone to the agency and to the voluntary association it works with, an exciting tone of inquiry and exploration which creates a climate for growth and experimentation.

Because it is still being evolved, the concept of a "center"-agency is difficult to describe clearly. At this stage I have done the best I can. In the concluding sections of this paper I should like to relate the "center"-agency to my thesis: namely, the movement of voluntary planning from co-ordination, to action, to purpose.

Co-ordination is a good democratic term. I suspect this is so because in totalitarian societies co-ordination of citizens' efforts is not a problem for voluntary action. The co-ordination for all groups is done by central governmental authority.

But I am not sure we know what "co-ordination" means. It stems from the Latin 'ordinare,' which means to "regulate." By adding the prefix "co," I suspect we mean to say to regulate co-operatively. And yet in free societies voluntary planning uses co-ordination in order to avoid regulation. Its positive aim is to bring about some common and harmonious action. But I believe that the term is more dynamic than we care to admit; for it implies that the common and harmonious action does in fact aim at some end.

From an analysis of our own experience, we have concluded that a "center"-agency should not undertake to co-ordinate any given broad and complex field.[12] To do so would mean either an overt or covert imposition of purposes. Thus the voluntary nature of the planning would be defeated. Nevertheless, co-ordination is valuable for two reasons: first, it is probably the only point at which voluntary planning can begin. It negates suspicion; it helps agencies get used to working together; and its clearing house services have a certain initial usefulness. Second, co-ordination can move voluntary planning to the level of co-operative action. This will happen more rapidly if co-ordination is seen as something dynamic instead of passive.[13]

---

[12] See Special Report, op. cit., p. 24.

In the context of voluntary planning I would define action as the overlaying of diverse interests with shared activity about the more important common problems. The key term here is important. In terms of voluntary planning in adult education, we have come to believe that the really important problems are those bound up with three questions:

1. What do adults need in order to make them "good" individuals?

2. What social and community needs must be met if we are to have a "good" society?

3. What are the truths or realities that we want to be the substance of adult learning?

These questions are abstract and theoretical because the really important problems are the philosophic ones. Thus, action as it is here defined would inevitably move voluntary planning to a concern for purposes.

I should like to describe briefly now several of the areas of action we are currently interested in. Some of these we have initiated; some we have applied a kind of catalytic stimulus to; and some we have provided a brokerage service for by identifying them and bringing them to some degree of national attention. The following areas of action, then, may not only be informative and interesting, but they are given to illustrate what we feel are some of the more important problems in university adult education.

1. The educational equivalency of adult experience.

We have undertaken at Brooklyn College an experimental program in which adults can have their life experiences evaluated in terms of academic credit. Thus, adults are enabled to qualify for the college degree on the basis of their achievement rather than merely on how many courses they have taken.[14]

---

[13] In this connection there is an interesting sentence in Clare Clark's Report (p.5): "But for the Joint Planning Commission the conception of a clearing house is of a dynamic, not a mechanical or passive service."

[14] See: How Much Does Adult Experience Count? and Adults Grow in Brooklyn. Two papers by Bernard H. Stern, published by the Center.

2. The Process of Maturing.

Our concern here is similar to the one reflected in the title of one of the Commission's recent programs on "What is happening to people in society today?" We have been involved in the large-scale Kansas City studies of the process of middle aging, of what happens to adults between the ages of 45 and 60. We have published one essay on the theoretical background for these studies,[15] and will soon publish a report on some of the findings of the studies.

3. The liberal education of adults whose previous education and occupational interests are specialized.

Here we are capitalizing on a relatively new awareness in America, that highly specialized education leaves a kind of emptiness that is bad for the individual and bad for the business and professional enterprise. This awareness adds an entirely new dimension to adult education, that general or liberal education, either denied or incompletely achieved in the early years, is now a principal responsibility of adult education. Currently, we are working on experimental programs with journalists, a Master of Arts Degree in General Education aimed primarily at school teachers and we are promoting the idea of residential adult education as a program format that can achieve results that cannot be achieved by formal courses in classrooms. We are much interested in things like the Harvard University's Advanced Management Program, its program of Nieman Fellowships for journalists, and in the University of Pennsylvania's Institute of Humanistic Studies for Bell Telephone executives. We also hope late this summer to sponsor a seminar on Advanced Education for Women in Business, to be undertaken in co-operation with industrial leaders and the National Secretaries Association. While the bosses are in Philadelphia reading Aristotle, we will have the professional secretaries off somewhere in the country reading and discussing Ulysses. We have also helped sponsor the College English Association's Institute on Industry and the Liberal Arts. In the area of liberal education for adults who are already "well-educated," we are also much interested in using university alumni associations as sponsors of adult programs.

---

[15] Robert J. Havighurst. The Social Roles of the Middle Aged Person. Notes and Essays, No. 4, published by the Center.

4. The adult education implications of urbanism.

Apparently this is also a concern of the Commission, for in one of its recent programs it asked: "Is the City destroying our pioneer virtues?" We have undertaken a number of actions: since "community development" is now such a large share of the adult education movement in America, we have undertaken some studies aimed at trying to clarify the concept of "community" in an industrial society. This study is undertaken jointly with the Society for the Study of Social Problems of the American Sociological Association. This year we are sponsoring a national conference of prominent urban university presidents, addressing this question: what new dimensions of responsibility does urbanism have for the university-level education of adults? We have also undertaken studies and analysis of certain major social trends. And we have underway an experiment we call "A Laboratory College for Adults," the central notion of which is to find out how the total learning experiences of a city can be used to help adults to learn from their own experience.

5. Providing intellectually challenging study materials for adults.

Here again I note your own concern with finding good program materials. In our work we have sought to make useful distinctions between materials for adults and materials usually used for adolescents; we have sought to provide good materials that recognize a distinction between those who want to be scholars and those who have scholarly interests. We have sponsored research on adult students' evaluation of teaching. And we have sponsored all over America seminars for university faculty members, addressing the problems of adult teaching and adult learning. These seminars are themselves a high-level form of adult education for faculty members whose professional interests are highly specialized.

6. Bringing the evening college movement to maturity.

We have spent much time and effort in developing an intellectually alert and professionally committed leadership for university adult education. We have done this by helping to plan national programs, by annual leadership conferences, by publications that seek to stimulate a professional literature in adult education, and by working with key committees of the evening college and extension associations. These kinds of actions lead inevitably, I think, to a concern for purposes.

Concern for purpose involves first of all consideration of the deeper needs of individuals and of the society. To illustrate what is meant by "deeper," let me quote a couple of insightful students of the contemporary American scene. The first comes from a member of the Commission's Commonwealth, Barbara Ward:[16]

> America, at peace, enters 1956 with unparalleled prosperity. . . . But instead of a year of hope, 1956 is seen as a year of fear. . . . Perhaps we have become a great country but we may have lost the promise of the future.
>
> ". . . the deep roots of our present fear have lain in the fact that the nature of our adversary has seemed to infect us. Fear of communism has bred fear of freedom. The control of subversion has brought curtailment of liberty." She quotes: "We become what we fight."
>
> She asks: ". . . is there something in the very structure and organization of modern, post-industrial society hostile to personal freedom and incompatible with individual liberty?"

An American observer asks a question that hits home: "Do we choose not to defend liberty because of a preference for other values which the defence of liberty might jeopardize?"[17] He adds:

> "Today every man builds his castle on the sand, and attempts by the modesty and homeliness of his architecture to pretend that it is only a cottage; he remains unprepared, in fact, for the moment—and they are not so few—when he needs a little room to be arrogant in. But this modesty has also a manipulative quality; he cuts his coat, not according to his cloth, but according to others' expectations of him."
>
> "Why do we turn," he asks, "to one another, not for affection but for ratification?"
>
> He counsels: "Liberal education, by showing us what the truth looks and sounds like, when people utter it in poetry, painting, or music, can help us remember what we were like before we became inferior."

These quotes I select, not because they are necessarily true, but because they well illustrate the substance of the problem of purpose. Moreover, these kinds of questions indicate, I think, the low-level usefulness of any voluntary planning that does not ultimately deal with the problem of purposes.

In this paper I began by assuming the unique importance of voluntary planning in a free society, and advanced the thesis that voluntary planning can be viewed as involving a movement from co-ordination to action to purpose. Another way of stating the thesis is this: intelligent solutions to particular problems depend upon seeing the problems in larger perspective, which in turn depends upon an appeal to purpose. Let me conclude by trying to illustrate this.

---

[16] "A New Year—And a New Hope." New York Times Magazine, January 1, 1956.

[17] Edgar Z. Friedenberg, "Liberal Education and the Fear of Failure." Adult Leadership, (January 1955).

In my voluntary agency suppose I am faced with the question: should we set up a counselling and advisory service for our adult clientele? One low-level but useful solution is to look around and see what other agencies are doing. This is information swapping, a part of co-ordination. A much more valuable kind of planning is to join with other agencies in activity to discover the deeper needs of our clientele. Finally, this will lead inevitably to some sharp but profitable debate between agencies with differing philosophies and purposes. Such a debate, in my judgment, is the mark of maturity in voluntary planning.

All this was put rather neatly in a recent letter written to the Adult Education Association by Robert J. Blakely. He said:

> "In general, I think that adult education needs some very hard and sharp philosophical thinking and logical analysis. This cannot happen without debate—mature debate, with sharp and clear confrontation of one position with another, with accommodation made by the discovery of real common grounds, not merely a genial kind of toleration of differences."

PLANNING FOR GROWTH IN ADULT EDUCATION

All available evidence suggests that for some time to come we will have a boom in adult education. Furthermore, I assume that this growth will be similar in kind to previous periods of growth in university adult education: that is, there is no reason to expect the nature of the adult enrollment to change unless we do something to change it. About 85 per cent of the adults will come for "credit" work in evening college and extension programs.[1] The predominate motivation will be a utilitarian one—better jobs, more "know-how," etc.

Therefore, we will have to do the kind of planning which will expand considerably the kind of adult programming we now offer. This is, of course, important and commendable. We will be plagued by crowded physical facilities, strained budgets and competition for able faculty members whose resources will be further strained by increased undergraduate enrollment. It is quite possible that in this general boom period adult education, already a stepchild, may get short changed.

Despite the importance and severity of these growth problems, I am not particularly interested in discussing them. There are three reasons for my reluctance: first, you will one way or another successfully solve these problems anyway; second, I have little to offer because you are obviously more competent than I to deal with these administrative—physical problems which are always somewhat unique to each local situation; and third, I for one am more interested in the planning we *ought to do* than in the planning we will *have to do.*

As an alternative, then, I would first like to identify the kind of planning we ought to be doing, and secondly, I should like briefly to list some examples of programs and concepts that could find fertile conditions for experimental growth during the boom period. In short, the kind of growth we ought to encourage in university adult education is the kind that departs boldly and experimentally from the traditional credit programming. Having said this, I want to make it clear that this assertion in no way implies that the credit programs are unimportant. They will always be important. They will probably always be the bulk of university adult education. It would be fatal to slight them or to leave their pressing problems unsolved. Be that as it may, after several years of study and research, we are convinced that the great future of university adult education lies in programs and concepts which do not parallel the established credit programs.

---

[1] This inference is based on research data collected by our staff and on the survey done by John R. Morton for the National University Extension Association. Furthermore, a study by Morton Gordon of our staff indicates that growth in adult enrollments tends to follow the growth patterns of higher education in general. The data from Gordon's study will be contained in the forthcoming book on the evening college, by Dean John P. Dyer of Tulane.

I will not attempt to make the complete case for this belief, but will merely cite three things: (1) The Stauffer study which clearly suggests that the preservation of our basic democratic values depends upon a generally or liberally educated adult citizenry;[2] (2) A feeling by competent observers that adults now reached by vocationally oriented credit programs get good specialized "schooling" but little good education; (3) Our present programs seem to offer little of interest to thousands of adults we are not now reaching.[3]

Following are fifteen programs and concepts which represent the kind of planning I think we ought to be doing:[4]

1. Programming with Common Welfare Groups.

The phrase "Common Welfare Groups" is my own designation for organized groups whose specific interests (often private and partisan ones) are overlaid to some extent by broad social implications. Their activities, whether by design or not, affect the broader public good; they influence, whether directly or indirectly, the common welfare. They are the business and industrial groups whose leaders head the trusteeship lists of our major social institutions and whose names dominate the guest lists of White House stag dinners; they are Bar Association committees who are worried over current tendencies to pervert the meaning of the Fifth Amendment; they are engineering groups, long concerned about the relationship between specialized and general education; they are regional and national church councils seeking to influence social trends and social problems without abolishing the separation of church and state; they are educationist groups which increasingly feel the pressure to liberalize teacher education; they are ad hoc groups of journalists wondering about individual autonomy in the face of the corporate nature of the American press; and they are groups such as the League of Women Voters, trying to achieve effective political action without taking politically partisan stands. These are the "Common Welfare Groups," which offer exciting opportunities in adult education.[5]

---

[2] See Samuel A. Stouffer. Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. New York. Doubleday and Company, 1955

[3] See especially the essays published in our Notes and Essays series, by Paul A. McGhee (A School for Optimists) and John S. Diekhoff (Schooling for Maturity). These tentative assertions also seem to check with findings from social roles research sponsored by the Center in Seattle and in Kansas City.

[4] On the following list, the first five "newer opportunities" are especially relevant to the residential type college; the last seven seem especially so to regional and urban institutions. However, all might apply everywhere.

The "common welfare groups" seldom need or want traditional college courses. They need programs—custom-tailored seminars, institutes, and conferences that are planned co-operatively by the group and the college.[6] Thus, the college becomes more than a space-renter or a broker of faculty talent for a fee; instead, it helps these common welfare enterprises face up to the frontiers of their social responsibilities; it helps these groups see not their surface needs but their deeper ones; it helps plan educational experiences to meet these needs. These needs are complex; therefore, the subject matter of the educational programs must be complex. It is precisely here that the needs of the "common welfare groups" touch upon what Walter Lippmann calls "the tradition of civility";[7] it is precisely here that the humanistic world of the liberal arts has so much to say about the change from barbarity to civility; it is precisely here that the liberal arts college has so much to offer to education explicitly for adults!

---

[5] I am not talking about hobby groups such as stamp collectors who do not ordinarily affect the common welfare in major ways; nor about blatantly partisan groups like political parties.

[6] We are increasingly aware that the co-operative planning of conference-type programs is tricky and involved, calling for a special kind of expertise. But it is encouraging to note that this expertise is emerging—with men like Herbert Thelen at Chicago, Theodore Green of Yale, and within the faculties of Harvard's Graduate Schools of Education and Business Administration.

The tragedy, of course, is that the liberal arts college fails to see this. And when it does, its departmentalized structure is ill prepared to respond effectively, its liberal arts specialists may reveal themselves as not very liberally educated persons.[8]

Nevertheless, despite the difficulties, several institutions have developed imaginative programs for these "common welfare groups": the University of Pennsylvania's Institute for Humanistic Studies for Bell Telephone executives;[9] Harvard University's "Advanced Management Program" and its Nieman Fellowships; the University of California's seminars for bank executives; and the program at Wabash College under a grant from the Kellogg Foundation.

The liberal arts college will be rightly concerned about whether an investment of time and effort in programs for "common welfare groups" might not cut deeply into its primary obligations to serve undergraduates, especially in the face of enrollment increases. I believe that this concern can be alleviated by considering such things as the use of resources and facilities during "off season," i.e., weekends, vacation period, and the summer months; the fact that such programming can be financially rewarding and most importantly, that these programs can greatly enrich and supplement the regular curricula by bringing to the campus and to the students a more direct contact with the vital and realistic world in which these "common welfare groups" function.

2. Establishment of Intellectual and Cultural Centers.

In David Riesman's "lonely crowd" culture there may be many adults who need an emotional-intellectual "home:"[10] Horace Kallen and others point out the need to liberate the adult from the regimen of day life;[11] Frederick Lewis Allen writes of Suburbia as "the breeding ground of conformity";[12] C. Wright Mills warns of the drift toward the mass society;[13] Friedenberg offers the liberal arts as antidote to the adult's fear of failure;[14] and many of us are sick at heart that the nation of Jefferson has become a land of persecution for the poet, the maverick and the dreamer.

---

[7] Essays in The Public Philosophy. New York, Atlantic, Little Brown & Co., 1955.

[8] This point anticipates my plea for liberal adult education for faculty members. See #5 below. Attention should also be called to the dangerous tendency (albeit justified) to regard liberal arts teachers as not being very effective in liberal adult education programs.

[9] E. Digby Baltzell, "Bell Telephone's Experiment in Education," Harper's Magazine, Vol. 210 (March, 1955), pp. 73-82.

There is here, I think, an opportunity for colleges and universities to establish "avant garde" centers for cultural and intellectual activities. There are a few models to look to: the program at Whittier College in California; the Museum of Modern Art in New York; Columbia University's seminars for faculty and professional people; some aspects of some of the "Test Cities" in the Fund for Adult Education Program.

Creativity and intellectual excitement are as important as they are rare; that they need a protective and nourishing "home" suggests an important adult education opportunity for our colleges.

3. Residential Adult Education.

In our judgment, the idea of residential adult education is one of the great new opportunities. In this country and elsewhere there are perhaps more models than you are aware of: The Philadelphia Junto's programs at Harcum Junior College; the programs at the Highlander Folk School and Goddard College; the Kellogg Center at East Lansing; the new center for continuing education being constructed at the University of Georgia. There are many other examples.[15]

---

[10] The Lonely Crowd, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1950.

[11] The Liberation of the Adult, Notes and Essays No. 7, The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Chicago, Illinois.

[12] See his articles in recent issues of Harper's Magazine.

[13] Mass Society and Liberal Education, Notes and Essays No. 9, The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Chicago, Illinois.

[14] "Liberal Education and the Fear of Failure," Adult Leadership (December 1954).

[15] For those interested in exploring the residential idea of adult education, reference is made to the writings of Sir Richard Livingstone, the pamphlet "British Residential Adult Education," by Guy Hunter and published by The Fund for Adult Education. Also, the Adult Education Association has a Committee on residential adult education which recently

I should like to suggest that urban area institutions and residential colleges might team up to promote the residential idea, especially for the "common welfare groups." The urban institution might work with groups most amenable to the residential idea, and in co-operation with the residential college plan programs for which the residential college's campus would be used. We believe that the notion of spending a weekend or longer on an attractive residential college campus may appear desirable to our urban individuals and groups. This idea may now appear more practical because many residential colleges are maintaining attractive hotels and inns. These facilities, in a campus setting, are ideal for residential adult education.

4. Programs for Alumni.

Colleges have generally looked upon alumni associations as sources of support and goodwill. The care and feeding of alumni is no doubt important if we are to recruit students, boost the football team, and conduct fund raising campaigns. However, we are beginning to see the emergence of a new concept of alumni work: it is the notion that a college's alumni are a ready-made audience for continuing education. Models for implementing this idea are to be found at Roosevelt University in Chicago and in the humanities program by Stephens College for its alumni.

5. Continuing Education for Faculty Members.

We are convinced that many faculty members are intellectually lonely. The compartmentalized nature of the academic structure tends to pollute an otherwise healthy campus atmosphere for liberal education. Our studies have revealed a striking lack of stimulating intellectual communication between faculty members. They don't "see" each other. There is a kind of intellectual smog. Far from criticizing the quality of our faculty people, we feel that many are ready and eager for an opportunity to con-

---

assembled a mimeographed report of residential adult education opportunities in the United States. For information, write to President Royce Pitkin, Goddard College, Plainfield, Vermont. President Pitkin is now writing for publication by The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, a pamphlet on residential adult education, and this publication will include a revision of the survey made by the AEA committee. Note should also be made of the International Conference on Residential Adult Education, held at Harcum Junior College, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, August 20, 1955. I assume that a report on this Conference will be issued, possibly through AEA channels.

tinue their own liberal education. There is an awareness that it is all too easy for a liberal arts discipline to develop its own vocationalism. As Paul McGhee has said: If you talk to an eminent chemist about poetry, you may discover that he belongs to the masses. But the chemist is not likely to admit it. Therefore, whatever we do, it is probably best not to call it "adult education." Furthermore, I believe that continuing liberal education for faculty members (and should we not also include trustees if at all possible?) must not be too systematically formal. Where we have seen effective adult education for faculty members, it is the ad hoc variety that arises from a quality that is as rare as it is precious: a campus atmosphere of intellectual excitement. The point I am talking about was well made by Henry Adams when he returned to Harvard as a faculty member, and said, "I come back not to teach but to learn."

6. Custom-Tailored Programs for Individuals.

In our society we have individuals whose educational needs are explicitly adult needs. They have these needs as individuals, not as members of any identifiable community group. A model for these programs is the one initiated and still taught at Chicago by Cyril Houle. It is a course for trustees of charitable, educational, and social welfare agencies. This is such a good example because it points up an educational need that adolescents simply could not have.

Despite my citation of Professor Houle's Chicago model, I have sometimes referred to the "custom-tailored" program as "The New York Idea" because it is the kind of adult education opportunity represented by New York University's Division of General Education, and the New School for Social Research.[16] The basic notions of these programs are: to begin with the individual adult's interest "where he is"; to exploit what Havighurst calls "the teachable moment"; to move the adult toward a standard of excellence in his particular activity; to reject any distinction between liberal and vocational; to disregard the whole system of undergraduate and graduate credit as completely inappropriate for meeting certain adult needs.

These programs bear no resemblance to the hobby and craft concepts of adult education. Their level is high; they are concerned with excellence, especially with the development of individual excellence.

---

[16] Statements about the philosophy behind this kind of programming are to be found in Paul A. McGhee's A School for Optimists, op. cit.

7. The Focused Study Programs.

In adult education during the past decade we have seen the growth of opportunities for adults to read and study "packages" of reading and discussion materials. I prefer to call them "focused study programs."[17] The models are such programs as: "The Great Books Foundation; the World Politics programs of the American Foundation for Political Education; The American Heritage Program of the American Library Association; and others, most of which have received assistance from the Fund for Adult Education.

Many colleges are affiliated with these focused study programs, and they are merely mentioned here as one of the newer college-level opportunities in adult education.

8. The Idea of "Community Development."

This idea is as dangerous as it is exciting. It is the idea that a college should enter the arena of social action, and by its influence and "know-how" engage in action programs designed to change the community. The college helps citizen groups to identify their own problems and then to organize to solve them. The college, primarily via its social scientists, provides the "know-how" and skills which the community groups and committees will need to do their jobs. The college or university thus becomes a so-called "change-agent," an initiating and catalytic agency to *change* the community; one of the purposes of higher education therefore becomes something like "social engineering."

I will not argue the pros and cons of community development as an opportunity for adult education. Instead, I will refer you to the growing literature on the subject,[18] and to the models now in operation at the

---

[17] Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education is now being prepared on the topic of "Adult Reading." Cyril O. Houle is writing for this Yearbook a chapter on the "package" reading program, which he refers to as "The McGuffey Reader of Adult Education."

[18] See Richard Poston, Democracy Is You, New York, Harper & Bros., 1953; Baker Brownell, The College and the Community, New York, Harper & Bros., 1952; Sheats, Spence, et al., Adult Education: The Community Approach, New York, Dryden Press, 1953. In Chicago, the work

University of Washington and the University of Southern Illinois.

9. Opportunities for Research.

It is unfortunate that colleges by and large fail to see the rewarding research opportunities in adult education. Adult education does not have to be a one-way street of "serving" the community; the college, too, has something to learn. Three major problem areas are crying for research attention:[19] First, adult motivations, the processes of aging and maturing, etc. Our behavioral scientists are becoming more aware of the fruitful notion that human life is developmental, a continuing process, not something to be chopped up into parts. Second, much research is needed on adapting curriculum materials and teaching methods to adult needs. And third, we need studies of major social trends and their implications for adult program planning. College presidents and deans who may be interested in a greater commitment to adult education may do well to call together their creative research people in the policy and behavioral sciences for a discussion of research opportunities in adult education.

10. Programs for the Aging.

Everyone is aware that ours is an aging population, and I merely mention this opportunity for adult education so that the listing may be reasonably complete. Again, there are a number of references for college administrators who may be especially interested in this matter.[20]

---

and writings of Herbert Thelen are also relevant. See Thelen's The Dynamics of Groups at Work, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1954. Thelen's work with the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Conference and the University of Chicago's experimentation with community block organization is recorded in Thelen's book and also by Stuart Chase in Reader's Digest (May, 1953), pp. 41-45.

[19] For an analysis of areas needing research, see "The Basic Problems in Adult Education," a paper presented by the writer at the Portland (Ore.) State College, February 18, 1954.

[20] Cf. the work and writings of Dr. Wilma Donahue in Michigan; the work of the Adult Education Association's Committee on Problems of the Aging; the Institute at Cold-Springs-on-Hudson, New York (Dr. Ruth Andrus, Director); the program of Utica College, N. Y. (Dr. Ralph Kendall, Director) as an example of a "Senior Citizens" program in a community college; Willis H. Reals' article in a recent issue of School and Society for an analysis of what eventing colleges are doing; and Poole's Guide to Periodical Literature for an index of the many magazine articles recently written on this subject.

11. The Use of Mass Media.

AM and FM radio, and especially television, present many new opportunities for college-level adult education. But here too, the subject is so vast that I shall merely list some reference sources.[21] In my judgment, the importance of mass media largely escapes the adult educator, and many feel an impending tragedy in our inept fumbling with this tremendous opportunity.

12. New Degree Programs for Adults.

Traditional degree-oriented adults are now served by "night school" opportunities and by innumerable certificate programs. We believe that newer opportunities lie at least in two additional directions: innovations within the traditional BA degree framework; and an entirely new concept of recognition for liberal education achievements by adults.

Within the traditional BA degree framework an important model is the project which we are sponsoring at Brooklyn College.[22] This project addresses the basic question: what does an adult's life experience really add up to in terms of the liberal arts degree? The basic notion is that an adult's life experience can to some extent be translated into academic credit.

Regarding more radical innovations, I have long felt that we must find a way to provide as much tangible recognition for an adult's continued cultural and intellectual growth as we now provide for the continued development of his occupational and technical skills. Why couldn't a community, in co-operation with the college, give an annual civic dinner in honor of those adult citizens who undergo the time and discipline necessary to make continued liberal arts study add up to something? I am here proposing the radical notion of something like a "Distinguished Cultural Award" for these adults.[23]

---

[21] Perhaps the best all-around practical reference is still the Joint Committee on Educational Television, The American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

See also: the 1954 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, especially the chapter by Robert J. Blakely; and, Television and the University, a report of the Committee on Educational Television of the University of Chicago; published by The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Notes and Essays No. 5.

[22] See the publication in the "Working Papers": Bernard H. Stern, How Much Does Adult Experience Count? A Report of the Brooklyn College Experimental Degree Project, Chicago, The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1954.

13. An MA Program "Explicitly for Adults."

Because of the success of the Brooklyn BA Program for Adults, we believe the time may be ripe to experiment with an MA Program in General Education "explicitly for adults." In providing for 'credit,' the degree would consider the educational meaning of adult experience; the degree would differ from the traditional MA in that it would be an advanced degree in general education rather than one signifying further concentration and socialization; it would focus on content and behavioral outcomes rather than upon prescribed sequences and 'time-serving;' it would seek to supplement classroom study experience with such things as special adult seminars, independent reading and some form of tutorials; it would also seek to supplement formal study experience with the many other educational experiences available in an urban situation; and the evaluation would be a kind of personal appraisal by a senior faculty evaluation board.

14. Penetration of Existing Organizational Structures.

One way for colleges to extend adult education is to offer new programs of their own and then try to entice adults to register for them. Another way is to tie in with existing organizations which can "deliver" large audiences and also, perhaps, the income to pay for the programs. This idea of course is closely related to the first one I mentioned, programming for common welfare groups. I have, however, treated this separately in order to emphasize that we tend to think of such organizations as League of Women Voters, PTA, etc., and forget that there are peculiar to America other "organizational structures" which we do not ordinarily think of as amenable to liberal or general adult education. I mention only two such structures as examples:

The first is the National Secretaries Association. This is a group of highly intelligent and influential women who already have established their own professional certification programs (The Certified Professional Secretary "degree") somewhat similar to the Certified Public Accountant system. The point is that there has evolved in our kind of society certain unpublicized organizations which affect the developing economy and character of the American system. Thus, we have been considering the idea of setting up an Institute of Humanistic Studies for such a group as the NSA.

---

[23] At present I know of two models which might well be the means by which adults could win such a "Distinguished Cultural Award." They are: (1) The interesting program developed explicitly for adults in Riverside, California, by the Extension Division of the University of California; and (2) The program now in operation by the Women's Association of Cleveland College.

A second kind of "organizational structure" is the county and state fairs. Along with the fun, social pleasure, and economic values of this peculiarly American institution, why not an intellectual or educational value? Perhaps one way to begin this "penetration" would be for the extension service of the state university to offer their liberal arts faculty resources in setting up a Chatauqua-type program as part of the attraction of these fairs.

What I am trying to stress here is the need for us to think boldly of new ways in which we ought to plan for the growth of adult education.

SOURCES

"I Am A Slippery Subject," prepared for delivery to the Wisconsin Adult Education Institute at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, August 9, 1954.

"The University Evening College," reprinted from NEA Journal, January, 1954.

"The Intellectual Challenge of Adult Education," opening remarks at a faculty seminar for instructors in the humanities, held at the Kellogg Center of Michigan State University.

"The Need for Theory in Adult Education," reprinted from *School and Society*, June 27, 1953, Vol. 77, No. 2010.

"Emerging Theory in Adult Education," written in October, 1953, as a discussion document for a graduate seminar in adult education.

"Adult Education—Means or End," reprinted from the Autumn, 1954 issue of *Adult Education*.

"Continuing Education and the Problem of Excellence," paper presented at a faculty seminar on adult education at the University of Washington, December 3, 1954.

"Adult Education, Lodestar of Democracy?," prepared for delivery at the state Adult Education Conference, held at Northern Illinois State Teachers College, Dekalb, Illinois, April 9, 1954.

"General Education and Specialized Education," a luncheon address to the governing boards of Utah institutions of higher education, Carbon College, Price, Utah, September 9, 1955.

"Adult Education's 'Third Force': The Concept of Meta-Credit," prepared for delivery to the Semestral Faculty Meeting of New York University's Division of General Education, May 12, 1956.

"Can Adult Education Associations Amount to Much?," prepared for delivery to the Pennsylvania Adult Education Association Conference, University Park, Pennsylvania, June 16, 1955.

"Voluntary Planning: *From Coordination to Action to Purpose*," prepared for delivery to the Joint Planning Commission of the Canadian Association for Adult Education, Montreal, February 29, 1956.

"Planning for Growth in Adult Education," prepared for delivery to the sectional meeting on adult education, Utah Conference on Higher Education, Price, Utah, September 9, 1955.

ERIC Clearinghouse
FEB 25 1969
on Adult Education

Publications of

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

The prices of Center publications, with exceptions noted, are:

Discussion Guides	$1.00
Reports	Single copy free. Bulk rate quoted on request.
Notes and Essays	Single copy free. Extras $0.25 per copy. Bulk rate quoted on request.
Offprints	Single copy free.

Discussion Guides

Analytical Reading
International Political Behavior. $3.00
Looking at Pictures: A Guide to Intelligent Appreciation. $5.00
Our Modern Art: The Movies
Scientists at Work
Themes and Variations: An Invitation to Literature
Understanding Group Behavior
Ways of Mankind

Reports

Administrative Policies and Practices of Evening Colleges. 1953.

Why Students Drop Out: A Research Report

How Much Does Adult Experience Count? An Interim Report of the Brooklyn College Experiment

Adults Grow in Brooklyn. Report Number 2 of the Brooklyn College Experiment

Conference Reports: (1) *The University's Responsibility for the General Education of Adults*, Chicago, Illinois, March 1955; (2) *Evaluating the Evening College as a Teaching Institution*, New Orleans, Louisiana, November 1955.

New Directions in Programming for University Adult Education. 1957.

Vassar Institute for Women in Business. 1957.

A Review of 1956: Center Activities and Projects. 1957.

A Review of 1957: Center Activities and Projects. 1958.

New Directions in Liberal Education for Executives. March 1958.

Offprints

Benne, Kenneth D. "Adult Education in a University," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. XXVII, Nos. 8 and 9 (November and December, 1956).

Diekhoff, John S. "The Alumni University," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 7 (October, 1957).

Dyer, John P. "What Do We Fear?" *Adult Leadership*, March, 1956.

Guthrie, E. R. *The Evaluation of Teaching*. University of Washington, 1954.

Kaplan, Abbott. "Liberal Education in a Business Civilization," *Research Developments in Personnel Management*, Proceedings of First Conference, University of California, Los Angeles.

Kempfer, Homer. "The President's Committee and Adult Education," *School and Society*, Vol. LXXXV (January 19, 1957).

Leys, Wayne A. R. "The Terminal Master's Degree," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 3 (Summer, 1956).

Love, Robert A. "AUEC Background—From Coffee to Capers to Educational Leadership," Association of University Evening Colleges *Newsletter*, Vol. VI, No. 1 (November, 1957).

Miller, Harry L. "What's Your Line? The Task of the Adult Educator," *Adult Leadership,* Vol. 6, No. 3 (September, 1957).

Miller, Harry L. "Why Don't We Have Better Teaching for Adults?" *Adult Education,* Vol. VII, No. 2 (Winter, 1957).

Schueler, Herbert. "The Method of Adult Education," *Adult Leadership,* April, 1957.

Schwertman, John B. "General Education and Specialized Education: A New Notion about Their Relationship," *Journal of General Education,* Vol. IX, No. 1 (October, 1955).

Siegle, Peter E. "The Adult Learner," *Adult Leadership,* March, 1955.

Siegle, Peter E. "The International Conference on Residential Adult Education," *Adult Education,* Winter, 1956.

Siegle, Peter E. "Something for Everyone," *Vassar Alumnae Magazine,* March, 1957.

Smith, Huston. "Teaching to a Camera," *Educational Record,* Vol. XXXVII, No. 1 (January, 1956).

Storr, Richard J. "The Public Conscience of the University," *Harvard Educational Review,* Vol. XXVI, No. 1 (Winter, 1956).

"University's Role in Adult Education" (a symposium), *Journal of Higher Education,* Vol. XXVI, No. 1 (January, 1955).

Others

Liberal Education in a Technical Age: A Survey by the National Institute of Adult Education. London: Max Parrish. $1.00.

John P. Dyer. *Ivory Towers in the Market Place: The Evening College in America.* Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. $3.00.

Notes and Essays

(Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 permanently out of print.)

5. "Television and the University." A report of the Committee on Educational Television of the University of Chicago.
6. Paul A. McGhee. "A School for Optimists." August, 1953.
7. Horace Kallen. "The Liberation of the Adult." March, 1954.
9. C. Wright Mills. "Mass Society and Liberal Education." June, 1954.
10. Daniel I. Malamud. "A Participant-Observer Approach to the Teaching of Human Relations Classes." February, 1955.
11. Stuart Demarest, Galway Kinnell, and Alvin Johnson. "New Directions in University Adult Education: A Symposium." March, 1955.
12. Gardner Murphy and Raymond Kuhlen. "Psychological Views of Adult Needs." April, 1955.
13. John S. Diekhoff. "Schooling for Maturity." May, 1955.
14. Royce S. Pitkin. "The Residential School in Adult Education." March, 1956.
15. "Professional Preparation of Adult Educators: A Symposium." December, 1956.
16. K. T. Elsdon. "Reality and Purpose: A Visitor's Reflection on Some Aspects of American Adult Education." May, 1957.
17. James E. Crimi. "Adult Education in the Liberal Arts Colleges." September, 1957.
18. "Liberal Education." Summary of a Discussion by the Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (reprinted from the 1955–56 Annual Report). September, 1957.
19. James B. Whipple. "Especially for Adults." October, 1957.
20. Burton R. Clark. "The Marginality of Adult Education." June, 1958.
21. John B. Schwertman. "I Want Many Lodestars." September, 1958.
22. Ida and William Hill. "Learning and Teaching through Discussion." September, 1958.